

Charles A. Fleming, Jr., Kress.
Grace M. Wright, League City.
Galen S. Brademan, Lexington.
John H. Seitz, Miami.
Jake C. Posey, Missouri City.
Rufus J. Tyson, Mobeetie.
James O. Bradford, Pettus.
Robert C. Brown, Premont.
Luis Felipe Garcia, San Diego.
Byron T. Worsham, Tloga.
Mar-in J. Cordes, Westhoff.

UTAH

Nathan J. Barney, Elsinore.
Florence S. Seely, Greenriver.
Eddis Reid Betts, North Salt Lake.
Frank K. Richards, Panguitch.
LaPreal Richards, Spring Canyon.
Ferne L. F. Barker, Wellington.

VERMONT

John T. McKeever, Brandon.

VIRGINIA

Gladys B. Wright, Bland.
Roy A. Lassiter, Boykins.
Retta E. Litchfield, Buell.
John B. Gillespie, Cedar Bluff.
Vivian C. Simmons, Heathsville.
James S. Cole, Jewell Valley.
Harry P. Allen, Rich Creek.
William T. Brittingham, Temperanceville.
John A. Spivey, Windosor.

WASHINGTON

Janice Smith, Kettle Falls.
Henry G. Riecks, Mercer Island.
Grace V. B. Coll, Nespelem.

WEST VIRGINIA

Howard C. Lowell, Colliers.
Anne M. Bailey, Kingston.
Arnold L. Strawderman, Mathias.
Virgil L. Farley, Matoaka.
Bertha S. Watts, McComas.
Cornelius B. Carrer, Shepherdstown.
Marjorie S. Sharousky, Vivian.
Roy L. Coleman, Wilcoe.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rear Adm. (retired) the Very Reverend Robert J. White, fleet chaplain of the Mediterranean Fleet during the last war, former president, Military Chaplain Association of the United States, offered the following prayer:

Bless, O Lord, we humbly beseech Thee, the deliberations of this day, as we turn the calendar from the month of May so meaningfully with the memories of our heroic and blessed dead.

Keep us mindful of the meaning of Memorial Day every day as we hear the solemn echo from a thousand heroes across the Nation urging us to keep faith with the fallen by lifting our hearts and minds in prayer to Thee, the author of life and the strength of government.

Teach us to pray because Thou hast ordained that man live not by bread alone but by faith, hope, and charity, because Thou hast ordained that man lives not to himself alone but in beneficent cooperation with other men in orderly government under God.

We ask humbly Thy divine help and the wisdom of Thy holy spirit and strength and confidence in our prayers to Thee.

Let us not forget that though nations may build heavy iron curtains to divide

men who otherwise might live in friendship and peace, no nation, however powerful, can draw a bleak iron ceiling across the skies to divide men on earth from God in the heavens. Let us not forget that while nations may jam with static the voice of truth which can make men free, no nation can jam with static the powerful pleading of our prayers to Thee, Almighty God, and the resultant blessings and grace to men.

Keep us mindful that there is no pact so powerful as God's pact with men who believe in Him and love and serve Him and find silent strength and faith in the sword of spirit given to us by God himself in days of old.

Behold, I command Thee, take courage and be strong. Fear not and be not dismayed because the Lord, Thy God, is with thee in all things whatsoever everywhere. We ask these blessings through Jesus Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1357. An act to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument, in the State of Maine.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1527. An act to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1754) entitled "An act extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. CORDON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REORGANIZATION BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the reorganization bill may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The reorganization bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there any minority report?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we have not agreed, but I ask that the conferees may have until midnight tonight in case there is a report.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would that include the right of the minority to file a report?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I will also ask that that be included.

The SPEAKER. Well, there are no minority views on a conference report.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May not the conferees express their views? They can do it on the floor, then, can they not, if they can get recognition.

The SPEAKER. A statement of the managers on the part of the House accompanies the conference report.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, what is the number of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will get it for my friend.

The SPEAKER. H. R. 2361. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. KARSTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Common Council of the City of Middletown.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial and in the other a resolution.

Mr. LeCOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news story from the Chariton (Iowa) Leader.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday quoting Charles Dickens' American Notes in 1843. It is as applicable today as it was in 1843.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND AS OBSERVERS WORLD ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT AT CAUX-SUR-MONTREUX, SWITZERLAND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 232) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee of five Members of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, to attend as observers the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament at Caux-Sur-Montreux, Switzerland, June 4 to June 12, 1949. The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the special committee as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the special committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee may make such reports to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as it deems appropriate.

The expenses of the special committee hereby authorized, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4617) to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children, and ask for its immediate consideration; and pending that, may I ask how much time the gentlewoman from Massachusetts believes we should have for general debate?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think one-half hour on this side will be enough. I do not have many requests for time.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 4617 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph I (e), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"Regulations issued under the authority of this subparagraph shall include, but not be limited to, the provision that a total disability rating shall be assigned, when the requirements of permanence and unemployability are met, where there is a single disability of 60 percent or more, or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent or more in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent. Such percentage requirements shall be reduced on the attainment of age 55- to a 60-percent rating for one or more disabilities and at age 60- to a 50-percent rating for one or more disabilities. The regulations shall also include a provision that a permanent and total disability rating shall be assigned without examination to veterans aged 65 or over [and in such cases pension

shall be payable, if otherwise authorized, regardless of unemployability] who meet the requirement of unemployability. For purposes of this part, marginal employment, including but not limited to, on own farm, in own business, or at odd jobs, at less than half the usual hours of work or less than half the usual remuneration will not be considered incompatible with a determination of unemployment and unemployability, if the restriction, as to securing or retaining better employment, is due to the disabilities."

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph I (f), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) The amount of pension payable under the terms of part III shall be \$60 monthly: *Provided*, That where an otherwise eligible person shall have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of ten years or reaches the age of 65 years, the amount of pension shall be \$72 monthly: *Provided further*, That where an otherwise eligible person is or hereafter becomes, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, the amount of pension shall be \$100 monthly: *And provided further*, That—"

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall apply to veterans of both World War I and World War II.

SEC. 3. Paragraph II (a), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"II. (a) Payment of pension provided by part III, except as provided in paragraph 1 (g), shall not be made to any unmarried person whose annual income exceeds \$1,200 or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds \$2,500."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of subparagraph (c) of section 1 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1281), as amended by section 11 of the Act of July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 556; 38 U. S. C. 503 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Payment of pension under the provisions of this Act shall not be made to any widow without child, or a child, whose annual income exceeds \$1,200 or to a widow with a child or children whose annual income exceeds \$2,500."

SEC. 5. No pension or increase of pension authorized pursuant to this Act shall be paid to any person who advocates or is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That there shall be considered as prima facie evidence, for the purposes hereof, an affidavit by a person that he does not advocate and is not a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates or is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts any pension or increase of a pension authorized pursuant to this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *And provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 6. Where eligibility for pension or increase of pension is established by virtue of this Act, pension shall be paid from date of receipt of application therefor in the Veterans' Administration, but in no event prior to the first day of the second calendar month following the enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That payment of death pension may be made from date of death of a veteran where claim therefor is filed within one year after date of death of the veteran, but no payment shall cover a period prior to the first

day of the second calendar month following the enactment of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children, and for other purposes."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4617) to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4617, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 106]

Abbutt	Goodwin	Passman
Bailey	Hall	Peterson
Buckley	Edwin Arthur	Pfeiffer
N. Y.	Halleck	William L.
Bulwinkle	Harden	Plumley
Burdick	Hollifield	Powell
Burke	Hull	Price
Carlyle	Javits	Priest
Celler	Jenison	Rabaut
Chesney	Kearns	Rains
Chudoff	Kee	Regan
Clevenger	Keefe	Sikes
Cole, N. Y.	Kerr	Sims
Combs	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y.	Lemke	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Stanley
Dawson	Lovre	Taber
Dingell	Lucas	Thomas, N. J.
Dollinger	McGrath	Walsh
Dolliver	Mack, Ill.	Werdel
Douglas	Marshall	Whitaker
Doyle	Murphy	Wigglesworth
Durham	Murray, Tenn.	Withrow
Elston	Nixon	Wolcott
Fulton	Norton	
Gilmer	O'Brien, Mich.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4617, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 356 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement reached earlier, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a modified pension bill which provides for \$60 a month for any veteran who is 70 percent disabled—single or combined disability and under 55 years of age.

If he is between 55 and 60 and is 60 percent disabled, he gets \$60 a month.

If he is 60 years of age and is 50 percent disabled, he gets \$60 a month.

If he is 65 years of age, regardless of disability, he gets \$72 a month.

This bill also raises the income limitation for a veteran without dependents, or a widow without children, from \$1,000 to \$1,200, and leaves the present \$2,500 limitation for veterans with dependents or widows with children.

It bars benefits to anyone belonging to an organization which seeks to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

An amendment was adopted providing that these benefits should apply to men who met the requirement of unemployability.

That is the amendment over which the controversy will rage today.

I am opposed to that amendment, and I think a vast majority of the Members of the House will be opposed to it when they understand it.

If this bill is passed in its present form, without this unemployability provision, as far as World War I veterans are concerned and those World War II veterans that are covered in the first three brackets, the cost will be \$20,842,000,000 between now and the year 2000.

Some Members have asked about this, and perhaps an amendment will be offered to strike the World War II veterans from the last bracket, and if that is done, as far as World War I veterans are concerned and those World Wars I and II veterans who are in the first, second, and third brackets, all combined, the entire cost of this measure, as I said, will be a little over \$20,000,000,000 from now until the end of the year 2000.

I make this statement in order that the Members may understand exactly what we are voting on. The amendment requiring a veteran to show unemployability is an amendment that has to be voted on separately. You will find it on page 2 of the bill. It was inserted in the committee and must be voted in the bill, or it goes out automatically.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

MR. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are asked to consider today, H. R. 4617, is the result of long and involved hearings by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

When the previous pension bill, H. R. 2681, was recommitteed on March 24, 1949, our committee initiated new hearings and called upon witnesses from all of the larger veterans' organizations, the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, the Social Security Administration, and others. One whole month was devoted to this testimony and the resultant data is compiled in an impressive volume of some 375 printed pages.

From all of this voluminous testimony, with its thousands of questions and answers, has evolved what is probably the most innocuous piece of pension legislation that has ever been presented to this House of Representatives.

The measure, instead of enacting new law as did the bill which you recom-

mitted, amends existing legislation and simply legalizes and liberalizes certain regulations promulgated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. To explain this in few words, without getting involved in too much technicality, the bill writes into law extension 5 to the 1945 disability rating schedule, which was promulgated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on October 7, 1948. This extension provided that any veteran meeting service requirements and income limits, less than 55 years of age who has a permanent single disability of 60 percent or more, or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent or more, making a combined rating of 70 percent or more, and who is unemployable, shall be entitled to \$60 per month pension. The same rate applies to a man aged 55 who has disability of 60 percent or more, single or combined, and upon reaching age 60, the disability requirement is reduced to 50 percent.

All of the above is now virtually law, by regulation, and will continue to be whether or not this measure becomes law. The bill before you affects the veteran who has reached the age of 65 by providing that he is not required to undergo physical examination but is deemed to be permanently and totally disabled upon reaching that age. Such a veteran, if unemployable, would receive \$72 a month pension, just as he does now, the difference being that he now has to undergo an examination to determine that he is 10 percent disabled. That is section 1 of the bill.

Section 2 is an innovation, in that it provides a rate of \$100 a month in lieu of the \$60 and \$72 rates for those veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Sections 3 and 4 raise the income limitations for veterans and widows. Under existing law the limitations are \$1,000 for those without dependents and \$2,500 for those who have dependents. The only change made in these limitations is that \$200 has been added to those who are without dependents, making the limit \$1,200 a year. Many members feel as I do that these limitations are entirely too low. This is best indicated by the fact that there are now pending before our committee 22 bills that would raise these limitations beyond the amount specified in this measure. The most popular limitations called for in these bills are \$2,000 for a single person and \$3,000 for one with dependents.

The limitation of \$1,200 in this bill means that it will bar from receiving a pension every regular Government worker. At the present time the lowest paid regular Federal employee receives far more than \$1,200 a year, in fact the starting rate for a CPC-1 employee, the lowest civil-service grade, is \$1,410 a year.

It is my hope that an amendment will be adopted to raise the income limitations to a point more compatible with the present high cost of living.

Section 5 of the bill bars benefits under the provisions of this act to anyone belonging to an organization which seeks to overthrow the Government by force or violence. In administering this sec-

tion the Veterans' Administration would require from the veteran applying for pension an affidavit that he does not advocate and is not a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence.

Section 6 provides that the pension or increase of pension shall be paid from the date of receipt of application but in no event prior to the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment. In death cases, payment is made from date of death if claim is made within 1 year thereafter.

Many Members of Congress are asking what will be the cost of this measure. You will recall that when the proposal was before the House back in March there were wild and fantastic reports in the press and on the radio of a probable cost of anywhere up to \$125,000,000,000 for the next 50 years.

What I cannot understand, and I know that the other members of our committee are equally at a loss to comprehend it, is why any estimated cost of a pension bill should be protracted to the year 2000. Never in my experience of 24 years in this House of Representatives have I heard of other legislative costs being so projected. Had we so estimated foreign aid or even operation costs of our Government, the figures would have been so gigantic as to be almost incomprehensible. So I believe it is but fair to the veteran and to the pension proposal to consider the cost for 1 year only, or at least for but 5 years ahead. We all agree that costs will increase as years go by, but there are so many factors that cannot be estimated closely or accurately that it is of little value to go beyond the near future in making an estimate. The Veterans' Administration experts tell us that their estimates of the additional cost of this bill for the year 1950 will be \$44,467,000. By the year 1955 this cost will have risen to \$63,958,000.

There has been considerable objection to the unemployability requirement for veterans who reach the age of 65 years. Because of the probability of amendments being offered to eliminate this clause, and I hope it will be done, I have asked the Veterans' Administration to give me an estimate of the cost of the bill should such an amendment be adopted. For the year 1950 the cost would be \$67,511,000, and for the year 1955 it would be \$248,236,000. In submitting these figures I would like to call attention to the fact that they cannot be justified to a point of accuracy. There are altogether too many imponderables. The Veterans' Administration officials stated that it was not a firm estimate but only a best guess, adding that it is quite possible that it may be as much as 25 percent too high or too low.

To sum up briefly what this measure would do more than existing law provides: Veterans aged 65 years or over would be presumed to be totally and permanently disabled, without necessity of physical examination. Any veteran regardless of age who needs the regular aid and attendance of another person would be paid \$100 per month in lieu of existing rates of pension. The income limitation

for veterans and widows without dependents would be raised \$200 to \$1,200. And, finally, veterans would be called upon to show by affidavit that they do not belong to a subversive organization.

This is about as little as one could do and still say he or she was helping the veteran. It will satisfy very few and benefit very few. I hope that the measure can be amended here on the floor so that something of real assistance can be given our veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to have prolonged discussion on this bill. We marched up the hill and then back down the hill a few weeks ago on a pension bill. I hope that does not happen again. This bill has been reduced, we think, to the irreducible minimum, if we are to have a pension bill at all. I worked for the stronger bill, as you know. I want to take this moment, however, to call your attention to the one big controversial question in the bill, which the chairman has already mentioned. I hope every Member will listen, because, so far as we on the Democratic side of the committee are concerned, this is the one big issue: The question of whether we will continue to require that a veteran be unemployable at age 65 in order to get this benefit. The present requirement of the regulation is that a veteran 65 years of age must be unemployable in order to get this benefit. The unemployability amendment seeks to continue that requirement. The committee one day, upon my motion, voted out that requirement of unemployability, so that any veteran reaching the age of 65 years, and having an income of less than \$1,200, would get the pension; but the next day the committee met again and voted that requirement back into the bill. The committee was considerably divided so that now the question is going to come up as to whether or not you are going to require that a man 65 years of age be unemployable. If you require that a veteran must be unemployable before he can get this pension, then you are saying that a veteran, and this is the interpretation that our legal staff places upon this language, that a veteran who is employable, no matter what he does, no matter how little he may get—it may be as little as \$25 a month—but if the Veterans' Administration holds that he is employable, he will get no pension whatsoever, regardless of the income limitation. In other words, if the Veterans' Administration holds that a man is employable just because he is trying to hold down a little job a greater part of the day, he will not be eligible for the pension even though his salary is far less than the income limitation. Any holding of employability would totally defeat his pension claim.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. And that will leave out about six out of every seven World War I veterans.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. So I want you to know that if you are going to say

that a man must be unemployable before he gets this, you are going to cut out most of the veterans and you are going to say to a veteran who is getting this small sum, that if he is held to be employable, he will get no pension whatsoever. I repeat that this goes to the very heart of this bill. Frankly, I believe that very little will be saved by writing this requirement into the bill. The cost of administration would be staggering. You not only would have to investigate every veteran upon becoming 65 years of age to see whether he was unemployable or not but this investigation would have to be made over and over again, certainly at least once a year and maybe oftener. It would require a great host of inspectors and investigators to go out and check into the life and activities of every veteran who becomes 65.

In some States a man 65 years of age is paid \$50 and more a month old-age assistance, and there is no unemployability requirement there. This is paid regardless of whether he is employed or not. If you write this requirement into the bill you will be requiring more of the veteran than you do of the nonveteran, and you will actually be giving the nonveteran an advantage over the veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the bill as it now stands. I want to make my position very clear.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend from Texas, a very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. The last time we had the pension bill on the floor there was considerable talk about the fact that we did not have proper and complete hearings. I know every member of the committee will agree with me that our chairman could not have been more fair; that we have had complete hearings; that every member was permitted to ask every question he wanted to ask; and that we heard every witness we wanted to hear. I want to compliment the chairman of the hearings that were conducted.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I want to make my position clear that I am supporting this bill as it was reported by the committee. If the committee amendment, which this committee did put in, is taken out in accordance with the suggestion to be made by the chairman and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], then from that point my position changes from one of support to one of opposition, because this bill cannot be conscientiously supported by Members of this House if that is taken out.

When the original Rankin pension bill came to the floor of this House many of you will recall that I opposed that bill. I opposed it for three reasons—because I believed it would jeopardize the veterans program in this country; because I believed it was based on a false philosophy; and because we did not have adequate consideration in our committee to

know where we were going. I do not believe that those objections which I had at that time apply to the bill as it now stands, as presented by your committee. This will not jeopardize the veterans' program, because it is not scattering broadside throughout the field of veterans' assistance, something that applies to all without regard to need or disability. This bill will cost the taxpayers of America \$100,000,000,000 less than the bill that was before us recently. So we can vote with much better conscience for this bill than we could for the other.

This bill does not speak the false philosophy of the other bill. I felt the other bill spoke a philosophy of giving all veterans some money and then forget about them. That is about all we could do with the veterans of the Civil War, and others, but we are doing and we can do much more and much better things for the veterans of our country at the present time than simply giving them some money in order to get them off our hands.

We have often heard the argument made in favor of a pension that we have to take care of these aged and needy veterans. That argument certainly is not valid with regard to a general pension. It is valid with this bill today. If you support the bill in the form in which the committee has presented it, you will be giving a program to benefit these aged and needy veterans to whom we owe an obligation.

The third consideration, that of lack of consideration by the committee, to which I objected in the first consideration of a pension bill, does not apply here. As my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has pointed out, we did have adequate hearings on this bill, and I feel the committee members had a chance to become adequately informed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I understand that by the committee incorporating the unemployability clause, they substantially put into effect the present law and regulations.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the most important part of this bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is that true?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is true.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The bill that is reported by the committee is substantially the practice now carried out by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It includes that and adds a few liberalizations, which I would like to list for the gentleman, if I might. It does put into the law those existing regulations. I think that is the most important provision. Pensions are not of any value unless there is an item of permanence of security applied to them. If the Veterans' Administration could give, as it did last October, this present program of payments for disability, it can take away just as quickly and at the same whim of those in control and authority. This puts it into law so that it must be retained.

Secondly, they have eliminated the physical examination for men 65. Under existing regulations the veteran must show 10-percent disability; as a matter of fact, most of them have been able to show that, and it has been a matter of red tape that we do not feel to be longer justified.

Thirdly, it raises from \$1,000 to \$1,200 the income limitation for single people, both widows without children and single veterans.

Fourthly, it provides \$100 flat pay for those who are disabled so as to need a regular attendant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin five additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the bill as presently written give to each veteran when he reaches age 65 a pension of \$72 a month regardless of his physical condition?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. At age 65 if he were entitled to it without regard to his physical condition. As a matter of fact, most of them can show 10 percent disability under existing regulations; but in addition to that there must be the additional factors of unemployability, which has a very close tie-up with physical condition, and an income not above \$1,200 a year for a single man or \$2,500 for a man with dependents.

Mr. RICH. In fact, the man must have disability at age 65 if he is to get the \$72 a month?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There is no need to prove disability. Under existing regulations he can get it for 10 percent.

Mr. RICH. In other words, then, if he is 65 years of age, he is going to get \$72 a month.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If he is unemployable and has an income of less than \$1,200 if single or \$2,500 if married or has dependents. But unemployability is a factor closely tied up with physical condition.

Mr. RICH. I understood the gentleman at one time to say that it was not. I would like to get that straight; I would like to know if a man is going to get \$72 pension at age 65 without any physical disability?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Without any ratable physical handicap.

Mr. RICH. In other words, it is a pension bill for everyone who was in the service, a pension when he reaches age 65?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; that is not it.

Mr. RICH. It certainly would be under the gentleman's interpretation, as I understood it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe I said that, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the position of the Veterans' Administration as to this amendment on page 2?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In regard to unemployability?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the case under existing regulations. The Veterans' Administration has been unwilling to give a yes or no answer to the amendment, as to whether or not it should be the law.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain a little more fully to the House the provision of that amendment which appears in lines 12 to 19 on page 2?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This amendment in lines 12 to 19 simply makes it clear that it is the intent of Congress that the Veterans' Administration shall not, as a matter of fact, find a veteran employable simply because he is able to putter around his chicken farm or take care of some little private business or to work part time at some particular place.

Mr. DONDERO. If that occupies one-half of his time that is not charged against him and he still might be able to obtain a pension?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to ask the gentleman to explain the position a farmer would be in, a renter, for instance, with a large family who has spent most of his savings and money putting his children through school; when he reaches age 65 he is employed but because of his age would not, naturally, be in a position to get employment. Just what position would that man be in under this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It would be a matter of fact to be determined by the Veterans' Administration as to whether or not he was unemployable.

Mr. JENSEN. But that 65-year-old man having worked all his life on the farm naturally at age 65 could not be considered employable. If things went against him, if conditions on the farm got bad, if prices went down, that fellow would be in pretty bad shape financially. What would the bill do for him?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. As I said, it would be a matter of fact to be determined by the Veterans' Administration. Under the probabilities of the situation the gentleman has presented, I would say he would be found to be unemployable.

Mr. JENSEN. He would be found to be unemployable?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is right. That would be the probability, I would say, on the basis of the situation the gentleman has just given.

Mr. JENSEN. And he would be entitled to a pension?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If his income did not exceed the limitation as set forth in the bill.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. If the amendment on unemployability is defeated and this bill passed, will we in effect be wiping out

the present regulations of the Veterans' Administration in that regard?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The present regulations requiring an unemployable test, if taken out of the bill, would be eliminated I would say, in my opinion, that would be considered as showing the intent of the Congress if that clause were taken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say at the outset that consideration of this measure on the floor here today is somewhat historic. It represents two times in the course of approximately 2 months that the Congress has taken up the matter of veterans' pensions.

Prior to consideration some weeks ago of the pension bill which was rejected by a one-vote majority, it has been 28 years since the Congress or the House undertook to debate or deliberate at great length on the floor of the House the question of pensions for veterans.

Heretofore, priority has been given to consideration of the question of veterans' pension legislation and even a special rule for this purpose has been approved and adopted by the House.

But, with all this historic precedent and rule of priority, it is apparently necessary to fight every inch of the way for adoption of a bill providing for adequate and proper veterans' pensions.

The hearings that have been held by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs since the original hearings have been most complete—and the subject has been careful and painstaking consideration.

The able and forthright chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], has been most patient and considerate in his conduct of the hearings on this bill. He has permitted all members to have all the time desired in asking questions of witnesses before the committee, and all witnesses desiring to be heard on the subject have been afforded every opportunity to present their views.

Among the witnesses heard were:

The legislative representative of the American Legion, Gen. John Thomas Taylor.

The national legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Omar B. Ketchum.

The assistant legislative director of the VFW, Mr. J. C. "Jack" Williamson.

National commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Lyall T. Beggs.

National commander of the American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS—Mr. Harold A. Keats.

Legislative director of AMVETS, Mr. Robert L. McLaughlin.

National commander, Disabled American Veterans, Gen. Jonathan Wainwright.

Representatives of other veterans' organizations, Members of Congress, and others appeared before the committee in this connection.

Gen. Carl R. Gray, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, was heard, as was Mr. Guy H. Birdsall, Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, Vet-

erans' Administration; representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, Social Security Administration, and other agencies of the Government.

Hearings were held on the general subject of pensions on January 27, February 1, 2, 3, 8, and 9, 1949; and, after recommitment of the original bill, on March 29, 30, 31, April 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 26, 27, and 28, 1949—18 days over a period of 4 months.

So, Mr. Chairman, a criticism may not justifiably be advanced that full and fair and adequate hearings have not been held on this question and that proper consideration has not been given the pending measure.

The bill as reported authorizes a pension of \$60 and \$72 per month for veterans of both World War I and II, depending on age, disability, and unemployability.

This unemployability is a new and novel feature injected into pension legislation which is deserving of the most thorough consideration.

The bill is in line with the amendments adopted on the floor to the original pension bill and represents an extension of existing regulations of the Veterans' Administration on this subject.

The original bill provided for a pension of \$90 per month for all veterans at the age of 65.

This amount was reduced by amendment on the floor from \$90 to \$72, the amount of the pension provided in the present bill.

Also, an income limitation, or so-called needs clause, was written into the original bill by amendment. This needs clause provision also has been continued in the present bill, so that a veteran with an income of \$1,200 or more is not eligible for a pension under this bill.

A veteran with dependents, and who has income of \$2,500 or more, under terms of the bill, would not be in need and, therefore, also would be ineligible for a pension.

The committee voted to report the language of the present bill, which follows existing Veterans' Administration regulations, rather than to recommend an entirely new bill unrelated to present applicable laws and administered by the Veterans' Administration.

In effect, this bill writes into law what the Veterans' Administration at present practices and follows under regulations promulgated by it with slightly moderate or liberal extension.

As an example, at the present time, a veteran at age 65, under Veterans' Administration regulations, with a 10 percent disability, is presumed to be permanently and totally disabled, and if he can make a showing of unemployability he would be entitled to a pension of \$72 per month.

This requirement of the necessity of showing unemployability before being permitted to draw a pension is proposed in the pending bill.

This feature of the bill should be stricken out, and when the amendment to strike the unemployability requirement is offered, I hope that this feature of the bill may be stricken out.

This requirement, Mr. Chairman, would make a relief measure out of the bill, not a pension law.

This question of showing unemployability is the fly in the ointment, the real joker or deficiency in this bill, the feature which gives the Veterans' Administration plenty of work, and the veteran little or no pension.

Should the unemployability clause as proposed in the pending bill be adopted, a vast amount of administrative work would be required. Field employees of the Veterans' Administration, of necessity, would have to go out in almost every case and investigate each individual veteran and determine what he is doing, how he is employed, whether he is employable, or unemployable, in the opinion of the investigator, and, if employable, whether 50 percent or 60 percent or more or less full time or part time.

We would in effect be voting additional huge sums for administrative expenses and at the same time enacting into law a bill which would in no effect be a true pension measure.

This unemployability feature of the bill is the major objectionable part of the bill. There are other sections of the bill that could, in the opinion of many, be improved, such as raising the income limitation, but certainly this unemployability limitation is the most crippling provision of the bill.

Such a requirement is most unjust and unfair. Historically a pension has been granted after each war in which the United States has participated to veterans of that war for honorable and patriotic service upon the basis of attained age, and this new and novel feature of requiring a showing of inability to work has never been written into our pension laws.

It should not be approved today.

Another reason assigned for objecting to the original measure was the suggestion made by a number of members that the Social Security Act should be broadened and expanded so that our veteran population would be covered by the social-security program and not be provided for under separate legislation.

Since that time, Mr. Chairman, that proposition has been exploded.

Representatives of the Social Security Administration, as indicated, appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and stated that no action or recommendation had been made by the Social Security Board to that effect or to the specific inclusion of veterans under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

Excerpts from statements made before the Ways and Means Committee showing that historically the veterans of our country have always been taken care of under separate pension legislation has been included in the hearings before the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Such testimony may be found at pages 460 to 505 of the printed hearings.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read from the testimony of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Green, under questioning by Mr. CARROLL, declared his opinion that the question of pensioning veterans "is a question which I think should be consid-

ered separately and apart from the social-security plan."

Then, Mr. CARROLL said:

The point that I make is that under a social contributory insurance system, even when a man is out of employment he loses certain of his benefits, and if the Government were to draft him into the service, the military service, it does not protect his insurance and it seems to me that there is a direct obligation on the part of the Government to give him that protection.

To which Mr. Green replied:

I think, Mr. CARROLL, that all those things should be considered, but I think they ought to be acted upon separately and apart from social-security measure and that a sound and constructive pension plan should be provided for the veterans, the principles followed in providing pensions for soldiers of past wars should be followed in providing pensions for soldiers of World War II.

I am in agreement with Mr. Green in this instance and feel that the majority of both the Veterans' Committee and the Ways and Means Committee agree with the statements made in this instance.

Certainly, the historic policy of the Congress and the country, with respect to the providing of a pension to our aged veterans in recognition of their honorable and patriotic service to our country in time of war, should not be abandoned.

In continuing the historic pension policy of this Nation, I know that the Members are interested in the reported or estimated cost figures on the pending bill.

It is estimated that the cost of the bill as presently drawn with the unemployability provision in the bill will be for the first year \$67,000,000.

It is estimated that the cost of the bill with the unemployability feature stricken out will be \$67,500,000.

And, it is estimated that the total cost of the bill will be approximately \$7,000,000,000 over a period of 50 years.

Certainly, it is unrealistic to estimate the cost over this extended length of time—as the measure may be amended or changed from year to year.

The Veterans' Administration, that has provided these estimated figures and who, by custom and practice, generally give the highest figure or maximum cost, has said that these figures may be 25 percent too high or excessive.

With the pension reduced from \$90 to \$72 per month, a big reduction in cost has been provided.

With the income limitation reduced from \$2,000 and \$3,000 as provided in the original bill to \$1,200 and \$2,500, further great economies have been insured.

And with the aid and attendance cost reduced from \$120 to \$100 per month a further and substantial reduction in the ultimate cost of the legislation has been provided.

The striking out of the unemployability clause will further reduce the administrative cost of the bill.

There has been a recent cut-back of 16,000 beds in the veterans' hospital program, the Congress recently reduced the Veterans' Administration budget by one-half billion dollars. There should be no further cut-back against the veterans authorized.

As the Members of the body well know, the House has recently voted several billions of dollars for foreign relief—relief of the people of Europe.

Only last week we voted a sum in excess of \$500,000,000 for foreign aid to the people of Europe with the specific requirement that this sum be spent within a period of 12 months.

The House failed to pass the previous pension bill. The present measure should most certainly be approved.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote from a statement which appeared in a recent issue of the news letter published by the Veterans of Foreign Wars concerning the Eighty-first Congress as we have taken action with respect to veterans' legislation:

Speaking of the present Congress, the report says:

It is the most tough-nosed Congress that organized or unorganized veterans have had to deal with. . . . It has sounded a note, an antiveteran sentiment, that may not die down until the issue is resolved at the polls in 1950, and probably not even then.

When the Congress convened, the VFW moved confidently in the direction of a realistic service pension bill, but all the time-tested arguments fell on deaf ears until now, just 5 months afterward, the VFW is striving desperately to salvage some benefit out of a weak and watered-down pension bill.

This article, Mr. Chairman, goes on to point out that even this weak measure may yet have to withstand an assault based upon the fact that many are projecting the cost over a period of 50 to 100 years in an effort to exaggerate the amount thereof and to stem up opposition to the measure.

Reports of the American Legion are of a similar tone.

These statements are not in line with the statements made on the Memorial Day just passed concerning the men who fought in the defense of our democracy.

We have just on Monday heard many beautiful words of tribute paid in honor of those who fought in defense of our freedom and our homeland.

Memorial Day in the recent past has come to mean more than a day for the memory of our fallen heroes. It has come to mean a day for us to recall that we have not fulfilled our debt and obligations to those who fought and died to bring peace to the world.

I think that we should say that it is timely and appropriate that we express our sentiments in some manner more substantial than mere words.

A lot of veterans, a lot of mothers, a lot of fatherless children are looking to us.

Let us pass this bill and thus fulfill a just obligation of a grateful Nation.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. According to the bill as written, a veteran upon reaching the age of 65 still has 2 hurdles to overcome. One is that he must show that he is earning less than \$1,200, if he is single, or less than \$2,500 if he is married, and the second is that he must

show that he is unemployable. It seems to me one test should be sufficient. The test of what his earnings are should be sufficient.

The reason the Veterans' Administration is applying the other test is that they do not apply the test of earnings. One test certainly should be sufficient, and the earnings test is the one that ought to be required.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman. I think his observation is quite pertinent. The income limitation is quite sufficient, in this connection, and no further limitation is needed.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin—a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I have handled quite a number of pension cases where I tried to get pensions for veterans of World War I under the present set-up. I found that a veteran in order to get a pension under the present set-up, with the unemployability clause, has to be 99 percent dead. Is it showing any gratitude on the part of the Government to wait until the veteran is 99 percent dead before we give him a pension?

Mr. EVINS. None whatever. One of the greatest costs of the bill, if the unemployability requirement is included, would be the administrative cost—the cost of administering this section. Representatives of the Veterans' Administration would be required to go all over the country in determining the question of unemployability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, after many weeks of hearings covering the bill under discussion, H. R. 4617, during which time representatives of many veterans' organizations testified, the bill was reported out of committee. The bill provides, by section, the following:

Section 1: Any veteran meeting service requirements and income limits less than 55 years of age who has a single disability of 60 percent or more, or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent or more, making a combined rating of 70 percent or more, and who is unemployable, shall be entitled to \$60 a month pension. The same rate applies to a man aged 55 who has disability of 60 percent or more, single or combined, and upon reaching age 60 the disability requirement is reduced to 50 percent. Note: The benefits applying below age 65 are now provided by Veterans' Administration regulation known as extension 5 to the 1945 disability rating schedule. At age 65 the veteran would be presumed to be permanently and totally disabled without a medical examination and, if unemployable, would receive a pension of \$72 per month.

Section 2: Provides rate of \$100 in lieu of the \$60 and \$72 rates mentioned above for those veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Section 3: Raises the income limitation for a veteran without dependents from the present \$1,000 to \$1,200. The

\$2,500 limit for veterans who have dependents is left unchanged.

Section 4: Raises the income limitation for widows without children from the present \$1,000 to \$1,200. The \$2,500 limitation for widows who have children is left unchanged.

Section 5: Bars benefits under the provisions of this act to anyone belonging to an organization which seeks to overthrow the Government by force or violence.

Section 6: Pension or increase of pension shall be paid from the date of receipt of application but in no event prior to the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment. In death cases, payment made from date of death if claim made within 1 year thereafter.

During the debate on the pension bill some weeks ago, I opposed that bill, H. R. 2681, on the grounds that it was too costly and if passed it would materially injure the cause of the veteran. I voted to recommit the bill for further study and had publicly stated that I would refuse to support the bill when it reached the floor of the House.

Today we are meeting to debate and vote upon a new bill—a bill which has had thorough study and during the many weeks of questioning witnesses, every individual member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee had full opportunity to not only express his own individual opinion, but also all the time desired to question the witnesses. We are now attempting to make into law the regulations of the Veterans' Administration as they now exist, with certain improvements. In amending the existing regulations, pensions are barred to those veterans whose disability is the result of their own misconduct or vicious habits. The membership will recall that it was my amendment during the debate on H. R. 2681 that would prohibit the granting of pensions to those in the service who had been discharged under the so-called blue discharge or bad-conduct discharge. At that time, I could see no reason to pay a pension to any individual whose service was anything but honorable.

As had been testified to during the hearings before the committee, the bill, over a period of years, from the year 1950 to the year 2000, would increase the existing cost approximately \$8,000,000,000. In my humble opinion this is a fair bill, a reasonable bill, and it is my intention to support it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it seems to be generally agreed at this time that proper and adequate hearings have been conducted on the proposed legislation. There seems to be general agreement by the Congress at this time on all the provisions of the pending legislation with the possible exception of one clause, which sets up the requirement of unemployability. We can brush the other provisions aside and address ourselves to that one issue.

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars as well as the DAV who have gone into this matter and given it study, are opposed to this provision.

No other pension system in the world makes such demands as this upon the veterans. The Spanish-American War veterans and the Civil War veterans were never subjected to a test so unfair and so unkind as this one. If this provision were placed in the bill, it would mean that the veteran would be faced with the proposition in each case, regardless of his age, of proving to the Veterans' Administration that he could not get a job as an elevator operator, that he was not able to work on a farm, that he was not able to drive a bus, that he was not able to act as a clerk, that he was not able to do any kind of work or enter upon any kind of gainful employment. Is it fair, is it just to enact into law a provision of this kind? There was a lengthy discussion at the time the bill was considered on the question of an income limitation. Now that the \$1,200 limitation is placed in the bill for single veterans and \$2,500 for married veterans with dependents, or \$2,500 for widows, what is the necessity of placing this provision in this bill? What does it accomplish? I do not see why we should be so inconsiderate and so unfair to the veterans of this country. I do not see why any old soldier who has reached the age of 65 should have to become a beggar and sit around on the streets and sell pencils. I do not see that that is necessary. I do not intend to support the amendment to this bill which attempts to place the veteran in a different class from other people and require a showing of unemployability with an income limitation the proposed amendment is unnecessary.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] a member of the committee.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, last week we gave away \$5,000,000,000 in the House without a roll call. I think the gentleman should be honored to point out that no country in the world, of these countries that we are giving billions of dollars to, demand that a veteran be 99 percent dead before he gets a pension.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. The gentleman is exactly right. There is no necessity of having such a provision as this in pension bills pertaining to our own American boys.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is the gentleman familiar with what effect this pension will have upon social-security or old-age pensions which the veteran may receive under the social-security laws? Does the veteran who is entitled, let us say, to \$60 a month under social-security and old-age pension receive this in addition to that?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Generally speaking, this will actually save the Government some money, because most of the States of the Union, where the veteran draws a reasonable amount of compensation from the Government, in the way of a pension, is not then eligible by their standards to draw on social security under the old-age pension provision of the social-security law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee two additional minutes and ask if he will yield at this time?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee. I think the unemployability test is wrong. As a matter of fact, I think the income limitation is wrong, and I shall support the taking of the unemployability test and the income provision.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman. I would like to see the unemployability and income provision stricken out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keating].

Mr. KEATING. If this amendment is not adopted, then, as I understand it, no examination by the Veterans' Administration as to unemployability will be required. Would that not save a very large amount in administrative costs?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. The gentleman from New York is exactly right. The cost of administration, the examinations, and the medical hearings that would be necessary and all the red tape and bureaucratic control and regulations involved would probably be more expensive to the Government and would actually bring about more expenses than the cost necessary to put this into execution.

Mr. KEATING. We have heard a great deal about the necessity for this amendment in order to save money and as an economy measure. I am interested in the gentleman's comparison between what we would save by including the amendment and what it would actually cost to put in the amendment in the way of additional administrative expenses.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman from New York is familiar with that provision. The necessity to investigate, and setting up the necessary boards and the calling of examinations and furnishing the proof and holding these hearings and having an administrative board would cost more money than the additional cost that this might possibly cost the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I appreciate the force and effect of the gentleman's argument that it would cost a tremendous amount of money and a great deal of effort to undertake to determine whether a man at 65 is employable or unemployable. But you have this standard of income in there. A single man who is earning less than \$100 a month will be eligible for a pension; if more than that, ineligible. A married man who earns less than \$200 a month will be eligible; if more than \$200, he will be ineligible. Those are self-executing tests, that are

self-evident, not open to debate, and will avoid a vast army of bureaucrats, men who, if they are harsh and unsympathetic, many deny a man a pension who ought to have it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Jennings] on his very clear statement of the facts involved. He is exactly right in his analysis of the situation. These provisions are self-executing.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. There is no adequate test for determining a person's inability for employment. For instance, a certain physical defect might preclude one man from working, but not necessarily another man with the same defect. In other words, a man might have both legs and arms off, lying flat on his back, and if properly trained, be able to study the stars, and therefore they could say that he was qualified to be an astronomer. So there is no adequate rule or test that could be set up to say that a man is not available for employment, providing some investigator so decided.

I am speaking from a medical point of view, and I know that physical conditions do exist on which the physician cannot definitely put his finger but which still handicaps the patient.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct when he says there is no definite test of a man's unemployability. If he had two arms off or one leg off and one arm or one leg off, he still might be able to accomplish something or do some kind of work. Private industry will hardly employ a man who is 60 or 65. It is becoming more and more difficult for him to get employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee one additional minute.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he felt it would cost more to administer this unemployability-test provision than would be the additional cost as a result of striking it out?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I do say that the cost would be tremendous. There is not any way of determining that exactly, just as the gentleman does not have any way of determining what it would save. I have heard arguments about it. I am familiar with some of the facts brought out. I know something about it. Other Members have made their contributions to this matter. Members have said they have certain indications that would show that this provision is in no way needed in this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman still say that, in view of the uncontroverted testimony that was given, that it would cost better than an average of a billion dollars a year to take this clause out of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, one point I would like to make in the very beginning is that if this bill is passed or not, regardless of what happens to this particular measure, there will be spent by the Veterans' Administration in the next 50 years approximately \$35,000,000,000, under the provisions of extension 5.

The bill as reported by the committee will cost an additional \$8,000,000,000 over the next 50 years. I personally would like for us to be in a position today to be more liberal, but the fact remains that if we take this unemployability feature out, according to the testimony presented by the Veterans' Administration, you will add to that \$8,000,000,000 cost over the next 50 years an additional \$65,000,000,000.

As far as I am concerned I want to be practical about this matter; I would much rather give the veterans of this country something than to promise them a whole lot and end up by their not getting anything. It has been charged that this bill as reported by the committee does not give the veterans anything. I deny that statement, because according to the Veterans' Administration's figures we shall be spending, under the provisions of this bill, a little better than \$200,000,000 a year additional to that which we are now spending.

A second point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that from a practical standpoint this is not a pension bill; a pension bill, according to my understanding of that type of legislation, gives certain remuneration on the basis of age plus service, as was done in the Spanish-American war veterans' pension bill. There you have no employability clause; you have no income limitation clause; it is purely and simply a matter of age and service. It would be better to name this bill a non-service-connected disability compensation measure; that is what it actually is. It sets up a scale of disability percentages and states that if the veterans meet those percentages of disability they are entitled to additional compensation. This bill, I repeat, is not a pension measure; it is a liberalization of existing regulations which gives compensation for non-service-connected disabilities.

The one thing that I would like to emphasize is the practicality of this measure. If you take the unemployability feature out you will be spending an additional \$65,000,000,000 a year. The gentlemen from Tennessee, both Mr. EVINS and Mr. PHILLIPS, mentioned the fact that you would save a great deal of money in administrative costs. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Veterans' Administration is presently using the unemployability test, and they are using it to the extent that they are saying that if a veteran is engaged in gainful employment 50 percent or more of the time that he is considered employable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Does the gentleman deny that the adoption of this amendment will increase administrative costs tremendously? Or does he deny that there will be a regular army of investigators out over the country as a result of it?

Mr. WHEELER. It will only cost an additional amount in direct proportion to the number of veterans who become eligible under the terms of this bill, because the Veterans' Administration is presently using the unemployability test. If we get a hundred thousand more veterans, it will cost more in direct proportion that the hundred thousand bears to the total now in that category; and in the long run it will cost \$65,000,000,000 more than if you leave it in.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman has not answered my question: Does the gentleman deny that it will increase administrative costs tremendously by reason of the large army of investigators who will be needed?

Mr. WHEELER. It will not cost a great deal more, and then the cost will be proportional.

Mr. EVINS. But I am right that it will cost more.

Mr. WHEELER. It will cost more in direct proportion to the number of veterans eligible under it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question with regard to the cost of administering this amendment. The gentleman said that the cost will be \$65,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. WHEELER. According to the number of veterans. That cost would be spread over the next 50 years.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That sounds more like it, but the gentleman said \$65,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry if I made that mistake. I am glad the gentleman has corrected me, because the cost is spread over the next 50 years, up to the year 2000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the Members of the House why they believe the Veterans' Administration should be the only department to give the cost of a bill over 50 years? I think that is manifestly unfair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Veterans'

Affairs Committee, I speak in support of House bill 4617. I am in full accord with this bill and feel that it is the best solution that could be worked out by our committee since the matter was referred to our committee again by way of recommendation. I speak as a personal observer of the efforts of our full committee to reach a fair conclusion about this pension bill and at the same time to consider the question of what additional obligation the country could assume at the present time in the light of rather disturbed business conditions. No member of our committee showed any desire to prevent veterans who reach 65 years of age from receiving some assistance from the Government but, on the contrary, exhibited a feeling that these veterans should be taken care of by way of a pension allowance in some practical manner.

The result of our efforts was House bill 4617. As analyzed, the bill authorizes a pension of \$60 or \$72 a month for World Wars I and II veterans depending upon the age and disability of the veteran. A rate of \$100 per month is authorized in lieu of the \$60 or \$72 per month where a veteran, regardless of age, needs regular aid and attendance of another person. The income limitation has been raised slightly for veterans without dependents and for widows from \$1,000 to \$1,200, while the \$2,500 figure for veterans with dependents and widows with children remains unchanged.

The drawing of compensation and retirement pay is prohibited to those persons who belong to organizations which advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, and to those veterans of both world wars who were discharged under conditions other than honorable.

Considering the fact that this bill grants relief to worthy veterans of both world wars at a cost of \$8,693,000,000 over a period of 50 years, I consider it entirely reasonable and well drawn. The total cost during this period for World War I veterans will be \$1,862,000,000 and \$6,831,000,000 for World War II veterans. The approximate outlay and cost of the bill for 1949 would be about \$44,000,000 which could well be worked into the amount now allowed the Veterans' Administration for handling the disability cases with a small additional amount. In fact, this is a pension bill the basis of which assumes that a person 65 years old has a 10-percent disability.

In conclusion may I say that the bill is very plain in its language and, under the circumstances, is quite reasonable. It takes care of a group of veterans who we all know, in many cases, need attention, and I sincerely hope that the House will pass it with few dissenting votes. The committee would have done more, but did not feel that the finances of the Nation at this immediate time justify it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation. However, I am opposed to the unemployability clause that is sought to be written into it.

The bill now under consideration will liberalize the requirements for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has conducted extensive hearings. The bill is the result of careful consideration. It deserves the support of the House, but, without the unemployment test.

This latter provision in the form of an amendment to the bill would, in my opinion, destroy the effectiveness of the bill and leave the whole subject of pensions in an unsatisfactory state. Under such proposal even the slightest degree of employability, no matter how meager, would be sufficient to preclude a veteran over the age of 65 from receiving a pension. This would be unfair, unjust, and unreasonable. We all know that employability in most cases where the individual is 65 years and over is very slight. It would set up a standard or test that has never been applied heretofore in any legislation of a similar character. Furthermore, the limitation of income provision of \$1,200 for single veterans and \$2,500 for married veterans, with dependents, is sufficient without the additional requirement of proving unemployability. To administer such a provision would take endless time in making the necessary investigations, and would incur so much expense upon the part of the Veterans' Administration that it could eliminate most of the savings such a provision would seek to make.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

Section 1: Any veteran meeting service requirements and income limits less than 55 years of age who has a single disability of 60 percent or more, or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent or more, making a combined rating of 70 percent or more, shall be entitled to \$60 a month pension. The same rate applies to a man aged 55 who has disability of 60 percent or more, single or combined, and upon reaching age 60, the disability requirement is reduced to 50 percent. At age 65, the veteran would be presumed to be permanently and totally disabled without a medical examination, and would receive a pension of \$72 per month.

Section 2: Provides rate of \$100 in lieu of the \$60 and \$72 rates mentioned above for those veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Section 3: Raises the income limitation for a veteran without dependents from the present \$1,000 to \$1,200. The \$2,500 limit for veterans who have dependents is left unchanged.

Section 4: Raises the income limitation for widows without children from the present \$1,000 to \$1,200. The \$2,500 limitation for widows who have children is left unchanged.

Section 5: Bars benefits under the provisions of this act to anyone belonging to an organization which seeks to overthrow the Government by force or violence.

Section 6: Pension or increase of pension shall be paid from the date of receipt of application but in no event prior to the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment.

In death cases, payment made from date of death if claim made within 1 year thereafter.

Thus, the bill authorizes a pension of \$60 or \$72 a month for all veterans depending upon the age and disability of the veteran as I have explained. In addition, the rate of \$100 per month is authorized in lieu of the \$60 and \$72 a month pension for any veteran regardless of age who needs the regular aid and attendance of another person.

The income limitation for veterans without dependents and widows without children is raised from \$1,000 to \$1,200, while the \$2,500 figures for veterans with dependents and widows with children remains unchanged. Benefits are barred to those persons who belong to organizations which advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. The act is effective on the first day of the second month following approval.

It is the duty of a grateful Nation not only to honor and pay tribute to the heroism and sacrifices of our national defenders, but, also to do something for them in their hour of need. Fine words and speeches on Memorial Day expressing our gratitude and paying deserved tribute to them are all right in their place, but, the fulfillment of our obligation to them demands much more than words of praise. This bill seeks to accomplish something in their behalf that will prove helpful. It deserves the full hearted support of the membership of this House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I again say that I am extremely glad that we are about to pass some sort of a pension bill; not a very adequate one, but still something. I feel that it is wiser not to spend too much on this legislation, for we have a distinct obligation to take care of our service-connected disabled, and I know that you will all agree that they must come first. I would also like to speak in appreciation of General Bradley's statement on Memorial Day when he made reference to the number of veterans in hospitals who lie on beds of pain and whose future is uncertain. I think that is the feeling that every Member of the House has, that men in hospitals lie on beds of pain, and that we should remember them, and also to remember that their future is uncertain.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that several other Members desire to speak on this important measure, I wonder if the gentlewoman from Massachusetts would agree with us to extend the time for 10 minutes on a side.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield my remaining 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi after I yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the committee for reporting this bill. It is time that we

recognize the needs of the veteran with a sound piece of legislation. This is sound legislation in the form originally introduced and without the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the committee amendment and trust it will be defeated. If the committee amendment is adopted the bill will then be merely a Veterans' Administration bill. If it is defeated it will be a veterans' bill. We should legislate at all times for the veteran and no one else. If this amendment is adopted it will discourage many worthy veterans from trying to get needed relief. The entire program will bog down in red tape. The Veterans' Administration will be forced to employ additional thousands with the attendant cost to the Government. It will be much better and more equitable to spend this money on the veteran instead of using it to employ more people. If the amendment is adopted the veteran will be faced with chaos, confusion, and uncertainty. He is entitled to better treatment from the Government he fought to preserve. The harm this amendment will do will be out of all proportion to the money it will save. The welfare of the veteran cannot be measured in dollars.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NOLAND].

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the present pension bill. I would like to make reference to the fact that I voted to recommit the pension bill which we considered some months ago. That bill was recommitted for two reasons: First, that it cost too much money; and, second, that liberal provisions were already in effect under Extension 5 of the Veterans' Administration regulations.

After that bill was recommitted I went back to my district. One of my fellow veterans came to me and said: "How come you fellows up there in Congress failed to pass that pension bill?" I looked at him and asked, "Well, were you in favor of that pension bill?" His answer was: "Well, if you all were foolish enough to pass it, I would be foolish enough to take it."

Then we came back to Congress and went to work in the committee to consider a new bill. This bill, H. R. 4617, was very thoroughly discussed and considered, and in the opinion of the committee it was believed that a bill should be reported that would meet three objectives: First, one that would do justice to the aged veteran; second, that the bill would be reasonable in cost; and third, that it would pass not only the House but the Senate, and would be signed by the President of the United States and become a law.

This bill which we have before us today has been endorsed by the major veterans' organizations, with one exception. That exception is the inclusion of the unemployment clause. I should like to state that I would much rather be up here waving a flag than speaking in commonsense terms for retaining the unemployment clause which is under fire here today.

It has been said that this unemployability clause would mean a great deal in administrative cost. I should like to point out that the estimated \$65,000,000 additional expenditures without this clause would cover a great deal of administrative cost.

The Veterans' Administration is now administering the unemployability feature. They do it without an army of investigators. They do it by means of a simple little form like this. This is the form right here. It has questions on the front and back of it. The veteran's word is taken as to his unemployability. There is no investigation. We have every reason to believe that with this feature in the bill it will not call for tremendous additional administrative costs.

I think that here today it is our duty to act in reasoned judgment to pass a bill that will become law. I believe the bill reported, with the committee amendment, is a bill which does justice to the aged veteran. Its provisions are liberal; in fact, I should like to see these provisions extended to every person in the United States over 65; and who knows, we may be taking that first step here today in connection with this pension.

Without the unemployability clause in this bill, I cannot support H. R. 4617 because the cost over the long-run period of this bill will total \$100,000,000,000, which is an average of \$2,000,000,000 a year. This means, then, that two billion per year will be spent for non-service-connected pensions, as compared with approximately \$1,500,000,000 now spent for service-connected pensions.

In other words, this bill reaches such tremendous proportions that it endangers disability compensation for our disabled veterans, their widows and dependent children.

In 1933, the so-called Economy Act was passed by an overwhelming vote which eliminated certain non-service-connected pensions for veterans of World War I. There is a likelihood that the story may be repeated if this bill is enacted into law.

I shall always be for taking care of the disabled veterans, their widows and children, whom our country can never repay. At the present time before our committee we are considering legislation to increase compensation for disabled veterans, widows, and dependent children by some 20 percent, which will involve a total cost of \$400,000,000 yearly.

Our country is exceedingly grateful to the veterans of this Nation. But our first duty must always be to the disabled, and I shall continue to work for their welfare.

In the future consideration of veterans' benefits which now total approximately \$7,000,000,000 yearly, and which constitute the largest item in our national budget with the exception of the military, we must consider carefully the consequences of the pension legislation which we enact. American veterans have been given special opportunities after both world wars, by being placed in positions of trust and leadership. Veterans must repay the faith vested in them by leading wisely. The status of a veteran is not something to be trans-

lated into dollar signs by a raid on the Public Treasury. The power of every veteran and every veterans' organization should be used not for special privilege but for the general betterment of all the people of America.

I request your support of H. R. 4617 with the committee amendment, which requires the unemployability feature.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am for a pension bill, a forthright pension bill, one that is honorable. I am opposed to the unemployability clause. I opposed it in the committee and said that if we had it in the bill we would not have a pension bill for a great number of deserving veterans in the country.

We have heard a lot of words about cost, and we will probably hear a lot more. Let me tell you something of the figures that were brought before our committee by the different organizations and how they disputed their own words many times. You have heard estimates of \$65,000,000 per year and \$65,000,000,000 over 50 years, and many other billions, but many times when you pin the experts down as to where they get these figures they will say, "Well, it was an estimate." That is not an excuse for us to withhold a pension to these older men who deserve one and who have served this country well.

We have had pensions in the past and they have been honorable ones. We have never had a clause like this in connection with any pension from the Revolutionary War to the present time. This relates to World War I veterans, those men who are now in need of it, but if it goes on the way it is proposed now, it will be something like the old-age assistance we have in the States, where you have a corps of investigators. They come around investigating the older persons, and they have to sign an oath that they are not able to take care of themselves, that they are paupers. Then, oftentimes, even if they sign the oath, they say it is just the same as telling them they are liars or cheats, or something like that, and they are denied old-age assistance. I do not say the Veterans' Administration will do that, but if we pass this bill you will put on a corps of investigators, thousands of them, to investigate every man, and you are going to lower the dignity of that veteran and debase his rights as a citizen and as a man who has fought for the Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is it not true that the representatives of the Veterans' Administration came before the committee, explained their figures, and submitted themselves to cross-examination by members of the committee, and that the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget also came before the committee, confirmed the Veterans' Administration figures, and submitted themselves to cross-examination by members of the committee?

Mr. STAGGERS. When this clause was taken out of the bill there was a lot of discussion about its cost. The next

afternoon we got the figures. I do not know where they got those figures overnight. I do not know how accurate they were. We have had a lot of talk about this. In trying to defend the great army of men who fought for this Nation, may I say that in the first war the great body of men were farmers, because our Nation was not as highly industrialized then as it is now. Those men went back to the farm after the war and they are still there, because they have not had the money to get away, as their children did who went into industry and were able to make more money. They are still on those farms. They are trying to work them. If the Veterans' Administration, or somebody else comes along, and says "Well, you can work a little garden, and you can milk a cow, and therefore you are not unemployable, and you do not get a pension," even though they have not been able to store up something for their old age, and may want to educate their children and put them through school, they will not get any help. I am absolutely opposed to this clause in this bill. Otherwise I am 100 percent for it and will work and vote for the measure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am for this veterans' pension bill, H. R. 4617.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am also for eliminating, and will vote to eliminate, the unemployability test which this bill sets up for veterans at age 65.

I am particularly interested in our buddies of World War I. Many of them have already reached the age of 65. This bill provides that those single World War I veterans, 65 or over, who have an income of \$1,200 or more per year, are not eligible to draw this pension of \$72 per month. Likewise, those veterans, 65 or over, with dependents who have an income of \$2,500 or more per year are not eligible.

These are known as income limitations or needs clauses. I am opposed to a needs clause in this or any other veterans' pension law. I so voted when veterans' pension legislation was before this House earlier this year. I so voted in our Committee on Veterans' Affairs when we were writing this bill. But a majority of the Congress and a majority of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has expressed itself as being in favor of an income limitation or needs clause.

So we have the income limitation written into this law.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think it is unconscionable and unjust to impose a second requirement of unemployability on these old veterans. It is apparent that the question of whether a veteran is employable at age 65 is, or will be, a very close question of fact in many, many cases.

To determine whether or not a veteran is unemployable will require a close examination of all facts pertaining to each individual case. This will require many investigators, a horde of employees to

gather the facts and make the determinations. Under such a system we will have bureaucracy at its worst, and all at the expense of the taxpayer, and to the great annoyance of the individual veteran.

I know of no other public pension system anywhere that imposes a test of unemployability as the basis for the allowance of a pension. It is a negative approach. It will discourage rather than encourage work. This country was built by those God-fearing men and women who believed in hard work. Let us not pass legislation, any legislation, wherein we discourage our citizenry from work. Let us not say to a veteran, "You prove that you are unemployable and you can have a pension." Rather let us encourage all our people to do what work they can, and when our veterans approach the evening of life let us pay them a pension, without strings, without harassment, but in honor of their service in the hour of their country's need. Let us strike this unemployability test out of this law. When we do this the pension will still be surrounded by too many restrictions. But, if we want to be reasonable, if we want to deal justly with our old veterans, we must not impose this unemployability test on them. Let us strike it out.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that veterans are deserving of pensions, and in their own right, for the plain and simple reason that they have given more in service and in sacrifice than any other group in our Nation.

Without them, we would not be here.

Now that the war is safely over, there are those who would conveniently forget what our men and women of the armed forces endured. There are others who would gloss over the distinction between veteran and civilian and erase the past as if these sacrifices and our obligation to the men who made them were inconsequential.

There are still others who try to undermine the veteran and all he stands for by spreading the mean and petty talk that so many served their country because they had to. This overlooks the essential fact that millions were in the armed forces and millions were not, and all the sophistry in the world cannot make veterans of those who are not veterans.

Any man or woman who wore the uniform of his country, whether for 6 months or 6 years, whether in domestic service or in combat, gave up precious freedoms which a civilian was never called upon to sacrifice. Due to the circumstances of war, the degrees of service varied sharply, but all who wore the uniform are entitled to that badge of honor and respect implied in the name "veteran."

There are many civilians who have relatives and friends in veterans' hospitals. With their own eyes they see the continuing casualties of war and they are deeply affected by this reminder. This is no story to be put aside when the make-believe reaches its conclusion. It is a stern and unforgettable reality, not to be changed by any wishful thinking. Broken minds and bodies, the price paid by some for the safety

of all, should be seen by the others, the thoughtless few who dare to criticize our veterans. Seeing this tragic, human cost, might shock them into understanding and humility.

The Government of the United States is giving the best of care to these hospitalized veterans. May God grant that it never forgets what it owes to them.

In supporting H. R. 4617, we must think of the millions of veterans outside and the invisible wounds they bear. We cannot forget that they interrupted education, jobs, and careers to serve their country. And many were unable to resume the normal routine of their lives. They returned, uprooted and restless, to find that the old home town did not look quite the same. Some have never bridged the gap, have failed to make an adjustment back to the way of life from which they were wrenched. The psychic scars of war do not show. How many men whom we pass on the street are victims of their military experience? There is no convenient method of estimating the number who have been affected, and no way of knowing how many lives have been sidetracked from normal fulfillment by war's exacting demands. That it is considerable, no one can doubt. I meet such men almost every day. They dress and talk in the conventional manner, but there is a new and strange reserve in their manner. And somehow, they do not seem to be able to hold a job. Occasionally one detects an underlying resentment which is hard to define. These men are veterans.

Perhaps as they look at the bland faces of those who never knew the meaning of war, they think of the inequality of sacrifice. These men know the ultimate of insecurity. They have looked death in the face. They fought against fear and terror. They remember young friends and the way they suffered and died.

Shall these veterans be subjected to the further insecurity of an old age in which a once-grateful Nation has forgotten them or attempts to ease its conscience by granting them a token pension for which they must qualify, not as veterans alone but as paupers?

I believe that a majority of those Americans who did not serve in the armed forces are nevertheless in favor of pensions for veterans in old age. The precedent was set in previous wars, and is considered as a matter of right and not necessarily of need. The large number of World War II veterans is no justification for default on this obligation. It should spur us to devise practical ways and means for the implementation of a suitable pension program.

The veterans have already bought and paid for these pensions at a cost in weariness and suffering which can never be measured. Remember that they bought safety for us, giving up the bright years of their youth on bloody battlefields. While we relaxed by the radio in the cozy warmth of our homes, many of them lay wounded in the cold and snowy nights of the Battle of the Bulge, hoping and praying that they would be found and ministered to before they perished. In fact, they paid the price of our indifference,

for had we been alert to our responsibilities, we would have worked with might and main to strengthen peace against aggression, during the long years when we had an opportunity to do so.

Can anyone in all conscience stand up and say that we do not owe them some amends for our mistakes? Or must they pay all over again by our neglect?

"But where is the money coming from?" the faint-hearted reply, forgetting that the veterans themselves will pay part of their own pensions. I remember that the money did come so that these young men and women would keep the actual horrors of war away from our homes and businesses and pleasant ways of life.

It seems that we find no difficulty in finding money to help other nations. There is good reason for this, of course, but there are more cogent reasons for taking care of our veterans in their old age. First, there is the inescapable moral duty. They gave to save us. It is our turn to give on a far lesser scale to help them.

To those who try to evade this clear call by various pretexts, I might appeal on the grounds of expediency. Business is coming to realize that the workers are entitled to pensions. Our Federal Government has belatedly recognized the necessity for an old-age contributory insurance set-up. Behind all ethical motives is the admission that sufficient purchasing power in the hands of those who, because of their age, cannot compete in the labor market—is good business. It helps to maintain the healthy circulation of the over-all economy—and each one of us is a contributor to, and a beneficiary of, that economy.

The chances for peace are better at this moment than they have been for some time. The Marshall plan is helping to restore the nations of western Europe to a position where they will be able to take care of themselves. There are further indications that Russia, faced with serious internal problems of her own, is impressed by this outside progress, in which she wants to share. To the degree that the western nations and Russia may be able to conciliate their differences, our international obligations will be eased, enabling us to pay some attention to the needs of our own people.

I offer this as assurance to those who put the financial question before the moral question on the bill to provide pensions for veterans.

The veterans of World War I are on the threshold of those years where they should receive visible proof of a Nation's gratitude, a gratitude unspoiled by any means test. I therefore suggest that we eliminate those provisions in the proposed legislation which, at present, would deny a pension to any single veteran with an income of \$1,500 a year or more, or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds \$2,500.

It is right and proper that disabled veterans should receive a more generous award, but our first consideration is to establish a pension system for all veterans, so that they may enjoy peace, sufficiency, and respect in their declining years.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln:

Let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan

of World War I and World War II.

Our responsibility in 1949.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as one of the few veterans of the Spanish-American War in this body, I have an especial interest in this bill. I could not permit to pass this occasion without lifting the voice of the veteran of a war 51 years in the yesterdays in behalf of the veterans of the two great world wars. I voted against the amendment with the unemployable feature because in honor no veteran of the Spanish-American War, enjoying the benefits of our pension law, could slap in the face the younger veterans with a provision that never had been written into any other pension law in all the history of the world.

There are not too many of my comrades of 1898 who are today among the living. On Memorial Day in the city of Chicago I marched with the little band of survivors of the war of over a half century ago in the magnificent parade of the veterans of all wars on the lake front of the metropolis of the Great Lakes. By my side was a comrade 86 years old. Despite his years, he marched with vigorous step, his shoulders straight and his eyes bright with the spirit of '98. I thought back 51 years to the time when these comrades of mine, now old men, constituted the flower of the youth of America. Life does things, Mr. Chairman, and none in the youth and prime of life can foresee the distress and the broken ends which the destiny of life may have reserved for old age.

The country which cheers its youth when that youth is on the battlefields cannot turn away in disinterest when the servicemen of yesterday are the old men of the today. It is a better, a richer, a finer America because of the generosity of our Government in protecting the men of 1898 from the vicissitudes of old age with a real pension law. I wish that law might be extended to include the veterans of all wars. The comrade of 86 by whose side I marched on Memorial Day in Chicago receives the last day of every month, with a regularity upon which he can count, until the end of his days, a pension check for \$90. There is no mocking unemployable provision. There is no provision as to income. There is no provision to embarrass him by forcing a disclosure of poverty. Rich and poor alike receive the pension, and the rich accept it as a duty not to bring embarrassment upon the less fortunate comrades who could not make ends meet unless their Government in a substantial manner showed its appreciation of their wartime service in days long since passed.

During the months that I have been in Washington as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress every day I have been thrilled with a sense of the glory of my country when my eyes feasted upon the inspiring sight of the dome of our Capitol Building. Every night, Mr. Chairman, when I look at that dome and

feel the thrills of love of country coursing through my system, I think of the greatness of a country and of a people that after 51 years has so remembered its wartime servitors that not one in his old age is without shelter, food, and clothing.

I hope and pray that the day will soon come in our country when every man and woman on reaching the age of 65 will receive a pension sufficiently large to provide the full measure of comfortable existence. That day will come as surely as the dawn of tomorrow will follow the darkness of tonight. Any economy that does not make full provision for the age of everyone whose youth and prime have been consumed in the maintenance of that economy is a false economy. Any nation which leaves its aged to shift for themselves, or to subsist on a tantalizing and cruel pittance, has failed to meet in full measure the functions of government.

But I am not willing to hold back the just claims of the veteran until for all the aged we are able to get all that I wish for them. I appreciate the sincerity of many of my fellow liberals who fear that an especial consideration of the claims of aged veterans would operate to the retardment of the program of social security to which we are committed. But while they have my most profound respect, and I know so well their earnest sincerity, I cannot accept their conclusions. To me it is just a matter of ordinary common sense to conclude that when a door has been opened one-fourth of the way it will be much easier to swing it the full remaining three-fourths than though the door were shut and jammed.

Mr. Chairman, the vote of this Spanish-American veteran will be cast for this bill, and he will go to bed tonight with a glad heart because in his service in the Eighty-first Congress has come the opportunity to extend, as it were, the hand of comradeship of 1898 to the younger veterans who so magnificently performed to the glory of America and the welfare of all the world in World War I and World War II. No nation was ever destroyed, nor was any economy ever endangered, when the quality of gratitude permeated and enriched its legislation. The cost of doing the right thing, the cost of being just plain decent, is something which people usually try to figure out only as an excuse for not doing the right and the decent thing.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill granting pensions to World War I and II veterans for age and non-service-connected disabilities, with one important exception, has my approval and support. The one exception, to which I object, is the amendment adopted in the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs before the bill was reported. This amendment would apply an unemployability test to those veterans age 65 or over in addition to a very low income limitation. In other words, before a World War I or II veteran who has reached the age of 65 years or over is eligible to receive the modest pension he is not only subject to a very low income limitation but also to a test of unemploy-

ability. Such requirement will serve to deny pension assistance to the majority of these old veterans. I am going to vote against this unemployability provision.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have always said, and I firmly believe, that no man who has served his country honorably in time of war should ever have to undergo undue hardships in his declining years. I feel that these men who fought to continue the democratic principles of this great country should be afforded security when they are no longer able to provide for themselves.

Much criticism has been made about the abuse of veterans benefits and we veterans do not deny that there have been some abuses to these benefits. We in the veterans' committee have done our utmost to limit these abuses and to design legislation so that it can be properly administered. In this bill the benefits will be paid to the needy and it is my fervent hope that this legislation will never serve to discourage any able-bodied man from continuing his employment. We veterans do not want a dole or to be continually draining the Treasury until we are a tremendous burden on our society, but rather we want to be assured that our comrades are kept away from the poorhouse and that they are able to enjoy the necessities of life when they are approaching journey's end.

This bill is the product of many long hours spent by the committee, holding hearings and gathering information so that they might make a sound approach to this problem. I feel that this bill has many remarkable provisions and it will have my support. In this bill the present provisions have been liberalized and the disabled veterans will be benefited. My heart beats in sympathy for the disabled people of this country and I am strongly in favor of the additional allowances for those veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need aid and attendance of another person. I don't believe that it is humanly possible for us to do enough for our disabled veterans. We can never repay the men who fought so gallantly in the recent world conflicts, but it is possible for us to lighten their burden and afford them a degree of security during their life's span.

I believe that this bill should pass and that we should further be determined to win the peace that these men fought for and the peace that many of our boys died for.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, we saw on the floor of the House a few weeks ago a new and novel procedure in legislative proceedings. I think it is the first time in all the years that the House has been in existence that we have ever projected the cost of any legislation over the period of half a century. We voted a billion or so dollars for Japan and we did not multiply that by 50. We voted nearly \$16,000,000,000 for the armed services, and we did not multiply that by 25 or 30

or 50. We have been voting these foreign countries five or six billion dollars a year, and we never multiply that by 50. A few days ago on the floor of the House—I know that there are some Members who are going to vote against the unemployability clause, and perhaps vote against this bill—they voted for the officer pay raise bill. But not a word in all the hours of debate did anyone suggest that we multiply the cost of that bill by 50 or extend it over a period of 50 years.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a scare campaign from start to finish. I want to tell you that I do not give one single solitary d— about what the Veterans' Administration says about the cost of this bill, if the unemployability clause is removed, because I think they have not been honest, and I think they do not believe it, and I think the only reason they did that is because they do not want to give up the board of investigators that they have and the doctors who are connected with it in private practice do not want to give up that business.

I was back in the cornstalk country of Missouri and made a speech Sunday and again on Monday. They were meetings arranged by veterans. If we are going to engage in a scare campaign I will let you in on a little secret. The boys mentioned the fact to me out there the other day that we had voted ourselves about \$4,500 apiece for extra clerk hire. They said "I suppose that means that more Members' daughters and nephews and nieces will get on the pay roll. We are going to watch the vote when it comes up the following week. We are going to watch the names of the Members who vote against this and who vote in favor of the unemployability clause which is now in the bill. We are going to watch that amendment and we are going to watch who gets the extra clerk hire."

Of course, when we voted that, we did not extend it over a period of 50 years. No voice was raised to say what that would cost the taxpayers of this country over the next 50 years. It is claimed that if this unemployability clause is removed, the cost will jump from \$8,500,000,000 in the next 50 years to \$65,000,000,000 above that figure. I say to you that there is not any sense or logic in that. It is an inane and untrue statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph I (e), part III, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"Regulations issued under the authority of this subparagraph shall include, but not be limited to, the provision that a total disability rating shall be assigned, when the requirements of permanence and unemployability are met, where there is a single disability of 60 percent or more, or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent or more in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent. Such percentage requirements shall be reduced on the attainment of age 55 to a 60-percent rating for one or more disabilities, and at age 60 to a 50-percent rating for one or more disabilities. The regulation shall also include a provision that a permanent and total disability rating shall

be assigned without examination to veterans aged 65 or over, and in such cases pension shall be payable, if otherwise authorized, regardless of unemployability."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike out the comma and all of the balance of line 10 and 11 down to and including the word "unemployability" and insert "who meet the requirement of unemployability. For purposes of this part, marginal employment, including but not limited to, on own farm, in own business, or at odd jobs, at less than half the usual hours of work or less than half the usual remuneration will not be considered incompatible with a determination of unemployment and unemployability, if the restriction, as to securing or retaining better employment, is due to the disabilities."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he starts his general discussion?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the sentence beginning on line 3, I wonder if there is not a typographical error. The sentence as reported in the bill reads: "Such percentage requirements shall not be reduced on the attainment of age 55 to a 60 percent rating for one or more disabilities" and so forth; but in the report on the bill, in both places where it appears, the word "not" does not appear.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not in the bill. The gentleman has the wrong bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is in the copy which I have before me.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has the wrong copy then.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Clerk did not read that sentence in his rapid reading, and certainly the word "not" appears in the print which I have before me.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, the gentleman has the wrong bill. The bill reported from the committee says "such percentage requirements shall be reduced on the attainment of the age of 55."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill I have in my hand, H. R. 4617, has the word "not" in line 4.

Mr. RANKIN. That is a typographical error. Let the Clerk read that sentence again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on page 2.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on page 2.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This is the crux of the bill. This amendment beginning on line 10, page 2, and ending on line 19, has to be voted on. Those who are opposed to applying this test of unemployability will vote "no." If this unemployability provision is left in the bill, you shut out six out of every seven of the old World War I veterans.

Now, they talk about how much this will increase the cost. As far as World War I is concerned, this measure will

simply amount to this, even with the other two provisions providing \$60 a month for a man who has a 70-percent disability and who is under 55 years of age; and providing \$60 a month for a man who is 55 years of age with a 60-percent disability, and providing \$60 a month for a man 60 years old with a 50-percent disability, with all those provisions left in as to veterans of both world wars and even to taking care of these old World War II veterans—and I submit it will be 25 years before World War II veterans reach the age that World War I veterans average now—it will merely mean that by the year 2000 the measure will have cost \$20,000,000,000, and not \$65,000,000,000 or the \$100,000,000,000 which you have heard so much about.

This House passed a bill without a roll call, just the other day, to give Europe, Asia, Africa, and Israel five or six billion dollars.

You are spending more money in Japan in 1 year than this pension bill will cost for these old World War I veterans in the next 10 years. You are spending money abroad on people who fought to kill our boys; but when we ask for a small pension for these veterans after they reach the age of 65 years, some of you want them to prove their unemployability.

Who is going to pass on that question? To say that you are going to ask some bureaucrat who would not know a boll weevil from a bumblebee, or a cotton stalk from a cocklebur, or who would not know wheat from tares, when an old farmer is unemployable, is simply ridiculous.

Let us follow the policy that has been pursued from the Revolutionary War down to the present time and take care of these old men when they reach that age, especially when they do not have sufficient income. The Government should not permit them to go to the poorhouse in order to get a meal ticket. That is the whole question here.

When the vote comes on this amendment, if you are in favor of pensioning the old World War I veterans, just as our forefathers pensioned the Revolutionary War veterans, just as you pensioned the Civil War veterans, just as we people in the South pensioned the Confederate veterans, just as we pensioned the Spanish-American War veterans, if you are for treating these old men in the same way, your vote will be "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with all the faults I might have, I believe that none of you will accuse me of ever making a demagogic appearance in this well. I just do not do it. I have come down here and made some speeches at different times in favor of or against, as the case might be, some very important matters when my position was very unpopular at the time. You know that is true. I do not come down into the well of this House and make demagogic appeals.

Mr. Chairman, Congress did not put the requirement of unemployability in the pension-for-Congressmen law. I was

not here when that bill was passed, and I am not criticizing it at this time, but Congress did not require a Congressman to be unemployable before he draws his pension, did it? No. It is not a requirement, as I understand it, in the pension that the coal miners draw nor that the civil-service workers get. Why require the old soldier to be unemployable before he can draw a pension? It just does not make sense, that is all, and it does not make for justice, either.

Just because a thing is popular does not necessarily make it right. Of course, I realize that. But, on the other hand, because a thing is popular does not necessarily make it wrong. It will be popular with the overwhelming majority of the people, I think, if we strike out the unemployability clause here; yes, I think it will be popular to do that, but it is right to do it also.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, in addition to putting the old soldiers in a class separate and apart and prejudicing them, putting them in a class where they will have to make a showing that other people do not have to make to be eligible for their pension, as a gentleman has suggested, you will also create more boards and bureaus to check up on these soldiers. Not only will that cost much money but it will create a bad psychological feeling on the part of the men who offered their lives for our country. It is also a departure, if I read the record aright, from all of the old-soldier-pension programs we have had since the inception of this Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, let us rationalize just a little bit. Suppose it does cost a lot of money. Of course, it will cost a lot of money. Most good physical things do. But, as one gentleman suggested, we do not multiply these other things we are doing from time to time in the way of appropriations by 50. You take your grocery bill, the annual expense of your grocery bill, multiply it by 50 or 100, and you get money in large figures. If you take many annual appropriations that Congress makes and add each one up for 100 years or 50 years, you will get astronomical figures.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I always like to listen to the gentleman. I think this is the second time I have heard him refer to the Congressmen's pension. Congressmen do not have a pension; it is something that they pay for; it is a retirement of just the same kind any employee pays for. The gentleman has made that statement half a dozen times. It is not the fact.

Mr. MORRIS. Let me answer the gentleman. I have great respect for him, as I believe he has for me, and I say that in all sincerity; but the gentleman has based his argument on a false premise. The gentleman has made his statement in all sincerity, I am certain, but it is erroneous, because this money that a Congressman uses to pay for his pension, or that the civil-service employee uses to pay for his pension, or the coal miner, and others, comes from the economy of our Nation. Yes; it comes from the

economy of the Nation. When a coal miner pays into his pension fund it costs you more for coal, and when a civil-service employee pays money into a pension fund it costs more for his salary. In other words, the taxpayers and the public are footing the bill. The wages and salaries have to be increased so the individual will have enough money to pay into the retirement fund. The public, of course, foots the bill of the raised wages and salaries.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. No; I cannot; I am sorry. The taxpayers, the public, will pay the bill; that is all there is to that, because the men who pay into their pension fund receive a wage or salary based on the theory that they are entitled to make a living and enough in addition thereto to provide a pension for old age. Therefore higher wages and salaries are paid than otherwise would be. The public pays the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, is it not a fact that this pension which the gentleman is talking about, that the veteran who is a miner or other person entitled to a private pension, will get this pension on top of the other?

Mr. MORRIS. As I understand, they will not get this pension on top of the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. They will not get it, as I understand it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Tell the gentlemen about the income limitations.

Mr. MORRIS. There are income limitations in the bill of course; most everybody is familiar with them I believe and I cannot spend any time on that; somebody else will probably want to talk on that anyway. I want to stay on this subject; let us get this point, it is important. I am not here, and I believe you all will agree with me, making a demagogic speech; I want to make this point clear. We Members of Congress are able to pay into a pension fund if we desire to do so because we draw a pretty good salary, do we not? Civil-service employees are able to pay into a pension fund because they usually draw pretty good salaries. Where do those salaries come from if not from the taxpayers' pocket? So when you say that Congressmen are paying it in entirely on their own that is a misnomer; that is not exactly the truth, for the taxpayers are paying it; that is where it comes from, the taxpayers; consequently when we give the old soldiers a pension the

taxpayers are paying it just the same as they pay it in the other instances; and I believe that you and I will be doing an injury to the old soldier, and I believe that we will be doing an injury to our Nation as well, if we keep this employability provision in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean that somebody who may be in favor of this amendment, such as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] who would have 5 minutes time in which to talk?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many Members wish to speak to this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has taken the names of the Members standing seeking recognition and will divide the time equally between them. Each Member will be recognized for 4 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this bill is in considerably different form than the bill which came before us about a month ago. I would like to ask a member of the committee a question concerning the pending bill. If the committee amendment is stricken from the bill, does the income limitation for single persons of \$1,200 under section 3 and \$2,500 for a person who is married, or with minor children, still limit the receipt of the pension?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, that is absolutely true. It does limit it. I would like to say to the gentleman also that there is scarcely a civil-service employee who would receive a pension, because most of them receive over \$1,400, and the income limitation is \$1,200.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, if this amendment is stricken, then those who want to vote for—you can call it a pension, and it is still additional compensation for the aged and needy veterans will still be voting for that and not for a general pension for all comers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think that is what has been concerning most of us here. In other words, the language on lines 10 to line 19 on page 2 merely puts the requirement of unemployability on top of the income limitation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is right. That is stated in another section that the income limitation would

be in the bill, and they must comply with it.

Mr. HINSHAW. And with the committee amendment we have two limitations; the income limitation and the unemployability limitation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is absolutely correct, and scarcely an old veteran would receive a pension.

Mr. HINSHAW. It would seem to me under the circumstances that the committee amendment is merely piling coals on coal; that is, it adds nothing particularly to the bill because certainly if the man with dependents can earn only \$2,500 or less, for example, say \$1,900, to all intents and purposes he is certainly partly unemployable in this day and age, I would think.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman considered the effect of the requirement that this unemployability be tested against disability? Under the present law where there is a 10 percent disability it is obvious that there has been a medical examination and a rating, and it seems to me that the language of the amendment to a certain extent denies the provision of the bill because it says that this will not be considered incompatible with the determination of unemployment.

Mr. HINSHAW. I get what the gentleman means. In other words, it does away with the present 10 percent disability rule under which a veteran 65 years of age with 10 percent disability can get \$72. It would require him to be able to work pretty nearly half the time in order to be able to get it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It then turns around and says if he gets some income at less than the usual hours or rate, if he cannot get more, and that is due to disability, he can still be considered unemployable. But, how can that be determined unless you have a rating?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it is too complicated the way the committee has written the amendment, and I would be in favor of striking it out. I do not think that the committee amendment is at all administrable and therefore I shall oppose the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offered the amendment in committee to require that a man be unemployable before he can be eligible for a pension. I did that for one reason, and that reason was cost. Under present law, without any new bill, the cost of non-service-connected legislation over the next 50 years such as this today will be approximately \$35,000,000,000. We met one day in committee and struck out the unemployability feature. That night the Veterans' Administration gave us an estimate that this feature would cost \$65,000,000,000 over 50 years. We met the next day and the committee adopted the unemployability requirement.

It has been stated on the floor that there will be hordes of personnel check-

ing over this. There is absolutely no basis for that statement.

It has been stated that this cost is not true. I do not know what other members of the committee did, but I have worked many hours trying to disprove the Veterans' Administration figures, because it seemed to me it could not possibly be that much. I spent about 3 hours yesterday afternoon on it. The members of the committee staff tried to disprove those figures, and they could not do it.

Little was said about unemployability until this bill came up. The American Legion came before our committee in January of 1949 and advocated a bill which had it in the unemployability feature. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], introduced it at the request of the American Legion. Mr. John H. Walsh, chairman of the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion, stated before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on Thursday, January 27, 1949, that one of their most important bills, H. R. 899, to liberalize the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes, is practically the same as this bill. He said this:

This is a most important bill, designed to liberalize requirements for eligibility to the permanent and total disability pension, stressing age and unemployability, increasing the rates, and elevating the income limitations.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I have great respect for the gentleman and for his views on this matter. There is one thing that worries some of us, that is, whether in requiring this employability test you are not indirectly placing a premium on indolence. Here is a worth-while, energetic, good citizen, a veteran, who is trying to carry on, trying to do something, and he is penalized, while another fellow, who is indolent and lacking in energy, draws a pension. I should like to have my distinguished young friend comment on that phase of the matter.

Mr. TEAGUE. If you take out the unemployability requirement, any man can sit down and draw a pension. If unemployment becomes prevalent and men 65 years of age cannot get a job, the fact that they are not employed and cannot become employed is proof of their unemployability. But I do not believe a man should be allowed just to sit down and draw his pension.

I do not know how much money we can afford to spend on veterans' legislation. Much has been said about our obligation to the veterans. I doubt that there is a Member of this House who saw more of the hell of war than I saw. Our first obligation is to our disabled, to the widows and orphans of those boys who were killed. If we vote for a bill that costs so much to take care of the non-service-connected cases, what is going to happen to the service-connected cases?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. We have before our committee a bill to raise all service-connected cases receiving pensions 25 percent. The Veterans' Administration estimated that that bill would cost \$400,000,000 this year. We had testimony before our committee last week that there are thousands of veterans in jails in this country who are insane because there are not sufficient beds to take care of them. We also have testimony, and I know a number of cases actually, of boys with tuberculosis who cannot get into hospitals. If they could get in when they first apply for admission they would probably have to stay in the hospital only 6 months, but since they have to wait for 3 or 4 months, consequently it takes years to cure them. I think first things should come first. Before we take care of any non-service-connected cases, we should be sure that those boys who are disabled are taken care of. A widow with a child gets \$100 a month. Last week I received a letter, and I think every member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs received the same letter, from the widow in Dallas with one child, who wrote that she had returned the American flag to the President which had been presented to her when they buried her husband. She wrote that it was a farce and a joke, and that money could not repay her for her husband, but that money could help to take care of her and her child, and that she could not possibly get by on the small pension.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I wish the gentleman would correct the statement which has been made that this unemployability provision would bar six out of every seven veterans of World War I. That is incorrect, and I wish the gentleman would correct it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, according to the Veterans' Administration, that amendment regarding unemployability would bar about 41 percent of World War I veterans and about 46 percent of World War II veterans. I can neither prove nor disprove that. I tried to disprove it, but, so far as I know, that is the correct figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of eliminating the unemployability clause. I think it is a very unjust provision to have in this bill. Already there is a provision in the bill which has never been placed in any other pension bill. That is the income-limitation provision. You are not giving these men as much in this bill as we gave to the Spanish-American War veterans or the other veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a very distinguished and able

former member of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If this committee amendment is adopted, then the bill becomes a Veterans' Administration bill and if the committee amendment is defeated, then it is a veterans' bill as it should be. Is that correct?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I would like to state that when the amendment went into the bill that afternoon, it went in hurriedly, but I have very good testimony, which I would like to put into the record as to the incorrect figures which the Veterans' Administration gave us.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], with whom I agree as to the necessity of doing more for our disabled veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE. Did I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that the unemployability feature is not in the regulations today?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No, indeed; certainly, it is in the regulations promulgated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but it is not in any law enacted by Congress. It does not apply to the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE. But it does apply to the non-service-connected cases of World War I and World War II?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, yes; but it is not in the other pension bills.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman not agree with me that if this provision remains in the bill it ceases to be a pension bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman. It becomes an entirely different matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have sat here listening to the discussion, but have failed to hear anyone state the position of the various veterans' organizations to the bill. At this time, I want to say that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are not only in favor of the bill, but are vigorously opposed to the amendment now before us.

Let me point out to you that if this amendment is adopted there will be three requirements the veteran of World War I and World War II must meet before he is entitled to benefits.

First, he must be declared permanently and totally disabled.

Second, he must meet the unemployability clause.

Third, he must meet the income limitation.

I say to you, in all fairness, most of these men who are permanently and totally disabled and who cannot earn more than \$1,200 a year, certainly are not employable.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman is familiar with the regulations which now prescribe 10-percent disability shall be deemed permanently and totally disabled?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Exactly.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the provision in the present Veterans' Administration regulation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I understand that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that that provision is in this bill?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am familiar with that, but I am not in favor of it.

Now, they have talked about the cost of this bill, and some have said it would cost \$65,000,000,000. I want to go back to the debate we had some months ago, when it was stated that the so-called Rankin bill would cost \$125,000,000,000. We proved it was untrue. The actual cost was approximately \$109,000,000,000. How did they arrive at that figure of \$109,000,000,000? They figured if every veteran of World War I and World War II would live to the year of 2000 and would have drawn \$65 a month for every month from the time he reached the age of 65, then the cost would be \$109,000,000,000. The same is figured here today. If every veteran lived to the year 2000 and received \$72 a month after reaching age 65, then the total cost would be \$65,000,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention to the fact that in 1965 the peak of World War I veterans will be reached, and long before you even approach the peak of World War II veterans the others will be exhausted. With those three provisions in the bill, a man under 55 and a man under 60, and then with the income limitation, with these World War veterans 65 years of age drawing this pension, the total amount would be \$20,482,000,000.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. May I continue from this point? There is nobody in this House or in the Veterans' Administration who can tell us how many veterans of World War I or World War II when they reach the age of 65 will be earning over \$1,200 a year.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say further, there is no man in this House who has had more to do with veterans' legislation than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. He has been through two wars and he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. To the best of my knowledge the Veterans' Administration when applying income limitations estimates that at least 70 percent of those applying will be declared ineligible.

The same experience will apply here. Seventy percent of the veterans of World War I and World War II will have been eliminated by reason of the limitation of \$1,200 a year income. Who can tell what the income of a veteran will be when he reaches the age of 65?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that when we were trying to pass the terminal leave pay bill, they estimated the cost would be eight or ten billion dollars, when, as a matter of fact, it actually cost less than \$2,000,000,000?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. When it comes to veterans' benefits they always talk about the cost. Let us apply the same criteria to Federal expenditures that has been applied to this bill. Why not take the Post Office Department deficit? It is \$326,000,000 today. Multiply that by 50 years and you arrive at the figure of \$17,000,000,000.

Let us talk about the Federal Security Administration. The cost today is \$1,217,000,000. In 50 years it will cost more than a total of \$61,000,000,000.

Taking the Federal civil pay roll into consideration, it is estimated to cost the taxpayers \$6,468,000,000 annually. In 50 years it will cost the taxpayers \$323,000,000,000.

Let us look at farm subsidies and losses. Today they amount to \$414,000,000. Multiply that sum by 50 years and you have \$21,000,000,000.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, when you apply the same criteria to Federal expenditures as I have done the cost of this veterans' bill which approximates \$20,000,000,000 is not unreasonable.

Mention was made here this afternoon of the enormous cost of veteran benefits. Let me point out at this time that last week nothing was said about the billions of dollars appropriated to aid foreign nations.

On April 13 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing the distribution to foreign countries of some \$92,000,000,000. I am again calling your attention to this matter by reading you a list of the countries and the amount of money they received.

Total distribution of United States loans, grants, and aids overseas, including unpaid balances on World War I loans (includes all Marshall-plan estimates for fiscal 1950, but does not include any funds for rearmament under North Atlantic Pact)

1. Austria.....	\$885,118,000
2. Armenia.....	39,942,000
3. Belgium and Luxembourg.....	1,744,000,000
4. British Empire.....	44,679,000,000
5. China.....	3,446,000,000
6. Czechoslovakia.....	17,348,000
7. Denmark.....	234,792,000
8. Egypt.....	59,700,000
9. Estonia.....	25,903,079
10. Ethiopia.....	16,447,000
11. France and possessions.....	13,371,000,000
12. Finland.....	24,600,056
13. Germany (bizonia).....	3,260,000,000
14. Greece.....	681,000,000
15. Hungary.....	64,000,000
16. Iceland.....	20,900,000
17. Israel.....	63,009,000
18. Italy.....	4,700,000,000
19. Iran.....	23,100,000
20. Iraq.....	7,805,000
21. Ireland.....	142,703,000
22. Japan.....	1,891,000,000
23. Korea.....	59,469,000
24. Latvia.....	10,713,000
25. Liberia.....	14,829,000
26. Lithuania.....	9,603,059
27. Netherlands and possessions.....	979,000,000
28. Norway.....	345,000,000
29. Philippine Islands.....	708,000,000

30. Poland.....	\$373, 630, 000
31. Portugal.....	11, 647, 000
32. Rumania.....	79, 435, 000
33. Russia.....	12, 793, 400, 000
34. Saudi Arabia.....	46, 200, 000
35. Sweden.....	104, 100, 000
36. Trieste.....	35, 200, 000
37. Turkey.....	305, 400, 000
38. Yugoslavia.....	117, 200, 000
39. American Republics (13).....	1, 651, 392, 000
Total.....	92, 169, 478, 135

This bill should be passed without the unemployability amendment. At this time I urge the membership of the committee to stand up and vote down this vicious amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] has expired.

All time for debate on this amendment and amendments thereto has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the unemployability amendment being written into this bill. With the restrictions as to income for single and married veterans now contained in the bill, certainly we should not further restrict the veteran with writing into the bill the unemployability amendment.

I feel certain when the vote is taken that the amendment, as it should will be defeated. Let us defeat this amendment and then pass the bill which will bring a portion of relief to the veterans who need it in their declining years.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment found in the present bill on page 2, line 10, where, in addition to all the other requirements and limitations of this proposed bill, a veteran is required to show that he is unemployable.

I think the insertion of this condition in the bill will well nigh destroy the benefits which would otherwise accrue to our veterans, both World War I and World War II, who have successfully defended this country in two great world-wide struggles.

It is, indeed, a late day to be for the first time considering a pension bill for World War I veterans. I was in favor of granting to veterans of all wars a pension a few weeks ago and, even with this objectionable feature of unemployability stricken out of the bill, it does not afford to the veterans of America as much recognition of their sacrifice and valor as I would like to see enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Concerning this insertion of the requirement that a veteran must show that he is unemployable, I think that will bring on endless controversies and investigations on the part of the Veterans' Administration and many aged veterans will be denied a pension if they are employable in most any line of work or employment. The bill already restricts the veterans by requiring that a single man shall not earn more than \$1,200 per year, and a veteran with de-

pendents not more than \$2,500 per year, and to say the least of it, these are enough restrictions without adding that the veteran must also be unemployable. The cost of administering such a provision as this can hardly be accurately estimated, but we do know that if it is retained in the bill it will not only require endless physical examinations but examinations and investigations in the field where the veteran lives will be made and all sorts of facts could be taken into consideration. It is my opinion that many worthy veterans would be denied a pension unjustly if we should retain the unemployability requirement.

I hope that we can defeat this amendment by a decisive majority and then when that is done, I am strongly in favor of this bill, H. R. 4617.

Even if it is not all that we had hoped it would be, if it proves to be inadequate and if the limitation of earning power is placed too low, maybe in the future we can amend it to make it what it should be. It should be remembered by the Members of this Congress that no group of veterans that have fought any war for the American people has had to wait so long as the veterans of World War I have waited for such a measure to be passed by the Congress of the United States.

Furthermore, there is every reason why World War II veterans who have attained the same age or who have the same disability or the same limited earning power should be included in this bill.

Another thing we should remember is that money and pensions granted under this bill will go to Americans and will be received and spent here in America among our own people. We have been generous with many foreign nations. It is certainly time that we should take care of the veterans of both World Wars, and after the objectionable feature of the bill is stricken out, I sincerely hope that this measure passes the Congress of the United States by an overwhelming vote, so that our veterans everywhere will know that their representatives in Congress recognize the great service which they have rendered to their country.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the so-called indefensible unemployability amendment for several reasons.

First, I believe that it establishes an altogether different and objectionable principle regarding veterans' pensions and would result in treating veterans of this generation on a different and less favorable basis than we have treated our veterans of every other war since the founding of the Republic.

Secondly, the income-limitation provisions of this bill adequately safeguard the Federal Treasury and Veterans' Administration against abuses, in that they establish a definite standard and lay down definite levels of income under which the contemplated pension payments may be made.

Thirdly, this proposed amendment would nullify to a very large extent existing regulations of the Veterans' Administration which permit certain veterans to receive pension benefits. Actually

there are very few veterans of the age of 65 who are unable to establish a 10-percent disability and it seems to me fatuous indeed as well as a distinct injustice to set up unreasonable and confusing technical obstacles to the granting of pensions which in a large number of cases could be circumvented in any event.

This bill writes into law present regulations of the Veterans' Administration regarding pensions for veterans at the ages of 55, 60, and 65 years of age, respectively. In addition, this measure would liberalize the above provisions by a presumption of total permanent disability without physical examination at the age of 65, increase of the income limitations for veterans without dependents to \$1,200, and if married to \$2,500. These increases would also apply to non-service-connected death pensions to widows without a child, or to a child of World War I or II veterans. The bill further provides for benefit payments of \$100 a month to disabled veterans in need of regular aid and the attendance of another person.

I am not deeply impressed with the claim that the elimination of the unemployability amendment will make this measure prohibitively costly. Of course the Veterans' Administration figures of its 50-year estimated cost are tremendous, but that would also be true of any other annual appropriation over the same period. From the veterans' standpoint, the appealing thing about the bill, without the crippling unemployability amendment, is that the pension would be paid without red tape or delay. It is easy to understand why the entrenched bureaucrats of the Federal Government resent and oppose legislation, the effect of which would be to cut down unnecessary and wasteful administrative expenses arising from additional paper work and necessary machinery to process medical examinations and the large number of claims that will ultimately be involved.

As I have pointed out so many times, the very best care, treatment, and hospitalization of the disabled, the wounded, and the maimed and all other service-connected cases is a primary and inescapable responsibility of this Government. At the same time we cannot overlook our obligations to the remainder of that gallant band of veterans who so unselfishly offered and sacrificed their lives and careers in order to defend our liberties and preserve the Nation. To deal with them differently than we have dealt with veterans of other wars would not only constitute a rank discrimination, but it would be a shameful display of ingratitude which, in my opinion, an overwhelming majority of the American people would never sanction or approve.

There are many ways other than in veterans' activities by which we can effect economy in conducting the Federal Government. We have already slashed very substantially the Veterans' Administration appropriation for the current fiscal year. In my judgment some of these cuts were unwise and will make for serious inadequacies in the service to and treatment of some of our veterans. To my mind, it is entirely unconscionable that this Congress should seek to economize at the expense of the wounded or

the needy aged veteran and I do not believe that there are many Members in this House willing to support such a policy.

There are of course imperfections, inconsistencies, and injustices connected with present veterans' pension laws. They should be revised, codified, and brought up to date and that is a monumental but necessary job which the Congress will have to tackle sometime, the sooner the better. For the present it may suffice that we provide laws like this one which exhibit the kind of concern and solicitude for our disabled and aged veterans and which the veterans and the country have a right to expect from the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TEAGUE) there were—yeas 57, noes 172.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph I (f), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) The amount of pension payable under the terms of part III shall be \$60 monthly: *Provided*, That where an otherwise eligible person shall have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reaches the age of 65 years, the amount of pension shall be \$72 monthly: *Provided further*, That where an otherwise eligible person is or hereafter becomes, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, the amount of pension shall be \$100 monthly: *And provided further*, That—"

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall apply to veterans of both World War I and World War II.

SEC. 3. Paragraph II (a), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"II. (a) Payment of pension provided by part III, except as provided in paragraph 1 (g), shall not be made to any unmarried person whose annual income exceeds \$1,200 or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds \$2,500."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of subparagraph (c) of section 1 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1281), as amended by section 11 of the act of July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 556; 38 U. S. C. 503 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Payment of pension under the provisions of this act shall not be made to any widow without child, or a child, whose annual income exceeds \$1,200 or to a widow with a child or children whose annual income exceeds \$2,500."

SEC. 5. No pension or increase of pension authorized pursuant to this act shall be paid to any person who advocates or is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That there shall be considered as prima facie evidence, for the purposes hereof, an affidavit by a person that he does not advocate and is not a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates or is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts any pension or increase of a pension authorized pursuant to this act, shall be

guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *And provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 6. Where eligibility for pension or increase of pension is established by virtue of this act, pension shall be paid from date of receipt of application therefor in the Veterans' Administration, but in no event prior to the first day of the second calendar month following the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That payment of death pension may be made from date of death of a veteran where claim therefor is filed within 1 year after date of death of the veteran, but no payment shall cover a period prior to the first day of the second calendar month following the enactment of this act.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, the bill to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 19, page 4, after the word "guilty", insert the word "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4617) to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. Does any Member unqualifiedly opposed to the bill have a motion to recommit? [After a pause.] The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 365, nays 27, answered "present" 5, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—365

Abbutt	Cooper	Hedrick
Abernethy	Corbett	Heffernan
Addonizio	Cotton	Heller
Albert	Cox	Herlong
Allen, Calif.	Crawford	Herter
Allen, Ill.	Crook	Hill
Allen, La.	Crosser	Hinshaw
Andersen	Cunningham	Hoeven
H. Carl	Curtis	Hoffman, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Dague	Hoffman, Mich.
Andresen	Davenport	Hollfield
August H.	Davis, Ga.	Holmes
Andrews	Dawson	Hope
Angell	Deane	Horan
Arends	DeGraffenried	Howell
Aspinall	Delaney	Huber
Auchincloss	Denton	Irving
Bailey	D'Ewart	Jackson, Calif.
Barden	Dingell	Jackson, Wash.
Baring	Dollinger	James
Barrett, Pa.	Dondero	Jenkins
Barrett, Wyo.	Donohue	Jennings
Bates, Ky.	Doughton	Jensen
Bates, Mass.	Douglas	Johnson
Beall	Durham	Jonas
Beckworth	Eberhart	Jones, Ala.
Bennett, Fla.	Elliott	Jones, Mo.
Bennett, Mich.	Ellsworth	Jones, N. C.
Bentsen	Engel, Mich.	Karst
Biemiller	Engle, Calif.	Karsten
Bishop	Evins	Kearney
Blackney	Fallon	Kearns
Bland	Feighan	Keating
Blatnik	Fellows	Keefe
Boggs, Del.	Fenton	Kelley
Boggs, La.	Fernandez	Kennedy
Bolling	Fisher	Keogh
Bolton, Md.	Flood	Kerr
Bolton, Ohio	Fogarty	Kilday
Bonner	Forand	King
Boykin	Ford	Kirwan
Bramblett	Frazier	Klein
Breen	Fugate	Kruse
Brehm	Fulton	Kunkel
Brooks	Furcolo	Lane
Brown, Ga.	Garmatz	Lanham
Brown, Ohio	Gathings	Larcade
Bryson	Gavin	Latham
Buchanan	Gillette	LeCompte
Buckley, Ill.	Golden	LeFevre
Buckley, N. Y.	Goodwin	Lemke
Bulwinkle	Gordon	Lesinski
Burdick	Gore	Lind
Burke	Gorski, Ill.	Linehan
Burleson	Gorski, N. Y.	Lodge
Burnside	Gossett	Lyle
Burton	Graham	Lynch
Byrne, N. Y.	Granahan	McCarthy
Camp	Granger	McConnell
Canfield	Grant	McCulloch
Cannon	Green	McDonough
Carnahan	Gregory	McGrath
Carroll	Gross	McGregor
Case, S. Dak.	Hagen	McGuire
Celler	Halleck	McKinnon
Chatham	Hand	McMillan, S. C.
Chelf	Harden	McMillen, Ill.
Chesney	Hardy	McSweeney
Chiperfield	Hare	Mack, Ill.
Christopher	Harris	Mack, Wash.
Chudoff	Hart	Madden
Church	Harvey	Magee
Clemente	Havener	Mahon
Cole, Kans.	Hays, Ark.	Mansfield
Colmer	Hays, Ohio	Marcantonio
Cooley	Hébert	Marsalls

Martin, Iowa	Potter	Stockman
Martin, Mass.	Poulson	Sullivan
Mason	Powell	Sutton
Morrow	Preston	Tackett
Meyer	Price	Talle
Michener	Quinn	Tauriello
Miles	Rabaut	Taylor
Miller, Calif.	Rains	Thomas, Tex.
Miller, Md.	Ramsay	Thompson
Miller, Nebr.	Rankin	Thornberry
Mills	Redden	Tollefson
Mitchell	Reed, Ill.	Trimble
Monroney	Reed, N. Y.	Underwood
Morgan	Rees	Van Zandt
Morris	Rhodes	Velde
Morrison	Ribicoff	Vinson
Moulder	Richards	Vorys
Multer	Riehlman	Vursell
Murdoch	Rivers	Wagner
Murray, Tenn.	Rodino	Walter
Murray, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.	Weichel
Nelson	Rogers, Mass.	Welch, Calif.
Nicholson	Rooney	Welch, Mo.
Nixon	Sabath	Werdel
Norblad	Sadlak	Wheeler
Norrell	Sadowski	White, Calif.
O'Brien, Ill.	St. George	Whitten
O'Brien, Mich.	Sanborn	Whittington
O'Hara, Ill.	Sasser	Wickersham
O'Konski	Scott, Hardie	Wier
O'Neill	Scott,	Wigglesworth
O'Sullivan	Hugh D., Jr.	Williams
O'Toole	Scrivner	Willis
Pace	Scudder	Wilson, Ind.
Patman	Secret	Wilson, Okla.
Patten	Shafer	Winstead
Patterson	Sheppard	Withrow
Perkins	Short	Wolcott
Pfeiffer,	Simpson, Ill.	Wolverton
Joseph L.	Simpson, Pa.	Wood
Pfeiffer,	Smathers	Woodhouse
William L.	Smith, Kans.	Woodruff
Philbin	Smith, Wis.	Worley
Phillips, Calif.	Spence	Yates
Phillips, Tenn.	Staggers	Young
Pickett	Steed	Zablocki
Poage	Stefan	
Polk	Stigler	

NAYS—27

Battle	Gwinn	Noland
Byrnes, Wis.	Hale	Rich
Case, N. J.	Hall	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Stanley
Coudert	Harrison	Taber
Davis, Wis.	Heseltin	Teague
Eaton	Jacobs	Towe
Elston	Kean	Wilson, Tex.
Gamble	Kilburn	
Gary	Morton	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Hobbs	McCormack	Wadsworth
Judd	Macy	

NOT VOTING—34

Bosone	Hull	Peterson
Carlyle	Javits	Plumley
Cavalcante	Jenison	Priest
Clevenger	Kee	Regan
Combs	Lichtenwalter	Sikes
Davies, N. Y.	Lovre	Sims
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Smith, Ohio
Dolliver	Marshall	Thomas, N. J.
Doyle	Murphy	Walsh
Gilmer	Norton	Whitaker
Hall	O'Hara, Minn.	White, Idaho
Edwin Arthur Passman		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Hobbs against.
Mr. Priest for, with Mr. Macy against.
Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Judd against.
Mr. Peterson for, with Mr. Wadsworth against.

Mr. Lovre for, with Mr. McCormack against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Sims against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Marshall with Mr. Javits.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. PETERSON. I voted "nay." If present he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. PASSMAN. Were he present he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. LOVRE. I voted "nay." If present, he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. DOYLE. Were he present he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PRIEST. I voted "nay." Were he present he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and ask to be recorded present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FROM SENATE FOR RETURN OF BILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 930) entitled "An act to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF CHARTER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, MONRONEY, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and KUNKEL.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish these few seconds to explain that I was unavoidably detained on the last roll call. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next at the close of the legislative business of the day on the subject of accident-prevention legislation for hazardous industries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

AMENDMENT TO DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 226 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided

and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might desire to utilize.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress a displaced persons bill was passed to take care, at least in part, of the unfortunate conditions of displaced persons. However, due to certain restrictions and limitations contained in that bill, very few of those whom we were trying to aid and assist have actually been permitted to enter our country.

The present bill, which will be considered if this resolution is passed, amends the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 so as to change the "cut-off" date from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949; it eliminates the statutory preferences of 40 percent and 30 percent, respectively, for displaced persons whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power, or who are agriculturists; it increases by 2,000 the number of displaced orphans to be admitted as nonquota immigrants; it authorizes the issuance to displaced persons and to displaced orphans in the western zones of Germany and Austria, and in Italy and to certain other categories of prospective immigrants, of immigration visas not to exceed 339,000; it provides for the proper quota reductions; it changes the "cut-off" date for displaced persons already in the United States, from April 1, 1948, to April 1, 1949; it adjusts preferences in the admission of displaced persons by including farmers and farm workers into the first-preference category; it extends for two more years, until July 1, 1952, the program of admission of "persons of German ethnic origin" under the German quota and provides for the admission under such quota of minor children adopted by American citizens prior to May 1, 1949; and lastly, it authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances to the Displaced Persons Commission, not to exceed in the aggregate \$5,000,000 for loans to American voluntary civic agencies cooperating with the Displaced Persons Commission in the program of resettlement of displaced persons in this country.

The Displaced Persons Commission's first semiannual report to the President and the Congress on February 1, 1949, stated in part as follows:

THE DISPLACED PERSONS PROBLEM

World War II left in its swirling wake the most tremendous population dislocation in all recorded history. Some of the movement was in a sense voluntary; the greatest portion was forced. Large groups of people were forced to move as an element of the Nazi program of slave labor, other groups were swept before invading armies, others fled to escape hostile occupying forces, still others are fugitives from political oppression and religious persecution. Most of these people

found themselves, at the end of the war, in Germany, Austria, or Italy.

The first of the major movements, before 1943, was due to Hitler's racial laws, slave-labor policies, and German military advances. The second, after 1943, was occasioned by Allied victories. The third, after the end of the war, resulted from banishment or flight because of political and religious oppression.

THE ORIGINS

These migrations—voluntary and involuntary—caused by the war and both its preludes and its aftermaths, began with the expulsions of Jews in Germany from their homes into ghettos and the growth of the infamous concentration camps. The next big movements came when the German conquest of Poland in September of 1939 immediately pushed several hundred thousand out of that country. Large groups went south to Hungary and Rumania, others north to Lithuania, but the great bulk went to eastern Poland, then occupied by Russia. This immediate movement of individuals was followed by a deliberate, calculated, forced deportation of Poles by the German Government, starting as early as October 1939. About a million and a half persons were moved. Many people were inhumanly exterminated, others were worked to death or died as the result of privations and other hardships. What happened in Poland is the pattern of events in areas overrun by the Germans.

The advance of the Allied armies—from the west and from the east—swept masses of people back and forth. No continental European country north of the Pyrenees was unaffected by these movements. Exclusive of the movements of armies, it is estimated that between 20,000,000 and 30,000,000 Europeans were moved from their homes from September 1, 1939, to the beginning of 1943; they were transported, dispersed, or deported. There is an estimate that at the peak in 1944, there were 8,000,000 foreign workers—prisoners of war and civilians—in Germany.

In the closing months of the war, as the Germans retreated, large numbers returned to their homes. Of the 12,000,000 or so persons evacuated because of German occupation from European Russian areas, to Asiatic Russia, only a few—who filtered back to western Europe—ever became United Nations displaced persons. When VE-day arrived, the Allied armies found about 8,000,000 displaced persons—persons liberated from extermination camps, from concentration camps, prisoners of war, forced laborers brought into Germany, and refugees who fled in front of the Russian Armies.

AFTER VE-DAY

After VE-day, the Allied armies were faced with the grave problem of these millions of homeless persons. Arrangements were made for immediate care and maintenance and every effort was made to effectuate their repatriation. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration followed the armies into Germany and Austria and assisted in these activities.

Within a short time, the great bulk of these people, about 7,000,000, were repatriated to their homelands. Some were returned under plans established by the allied armies while still others, impatient to rejoin their families and relatives, took to the roads in a seemingly unending stream of people with their few remaining earthly possessions strapped to their backs or carted in small wagons and baby carriages. This impatient movement of humans was for the most part headed westward toward France and the Low Countries. The remainder was somewhat augmented by new refugees who fled to escape political persecution or new outbreaks of intolerance. There remained approximately a million and a quarter displaced

persons, mostly from eastern European countries.

The United Nations, recognizing that the plight of these uprooted people constituted an urgent international problem, responded by the establishment of the International Refugee Organization. That organization has six responsibilities with respect to the displaced persons: (1) Repatriation, (2) identification, registration, and classification, (3) care and assistance, (4) legal and political protection, (5) transportation, (6) resettlement and reestablishment in countries able and willing to receive them.

THE PRESENT PROBLEM

Estimates provided by the Department of State indicate the number of persons displaced as of January 1, 1949, in Italy and the western areas of Germany and Austria at approximately 770,000. About 502,000 of these displaced persons are receiving care and maintenance from the International Refugee Organization in its camps and assembly centers. The others—also eligible under the IRO Constitution—are living in the local economy and earning their own livelihood. While efforts at voluntary repatriation continue, the results are diminishing, and it is evident that the great majority of these people cannot or will not return to their homelands because of fear of persecution or even death itself.

The western Allies have agreed that no displaced person will be forced to return to his native country against his will. It has been a traditional principle of this Government since its inception that our country is, in the language of President George Washington, "more and more a safe and propitious asylum for the unfortunate of other countries." That attitude continues to guide the activities of our occupation forces with respect to repatriation. The United States affirms the principle that there shall be no forcible repatriation of displaced persons and this principle has been accepted by the United Nations. Consequently, the destiny of this large number of displaced persons is in the hands of the free people of the world.

The United States has taken the position that resettlement, the fourth possibility given by General Hildring, is the best possible one for the remaining displaced persons. A large proportion of these displaced persons feel bitterly toward their former German conquerors and tormentors and refuse to live and work side by side with native Germans and, to a lesser extent, with Austrians. An even larger number fear the potential danger of remaining in areas geographically close to the reach of political oppression. The continued presence of these displaced persons in occupied areas of Europe constitutes a serious handicap to the authorities attempting to deal with the economic and social problems of those regions. It also represents a very substantial burden to the American taxpayer.

On December 22, 1945, the President issued a directive instructing the Secretary of State to make quota visas available to displaced persons. This evidenced this Nation's feeling of responsibility toward providing resettlement opportunities within the United States as a solution for the world problem of the thousands of homeless and suffering refugees of World War II. Under the President's directive, approximately 42,000 displaced persons were admitted to this country. On June 30, 1948, this directive was specifically terminated by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The United States has participated actively in the formation, operation, and financing of the International Refugee Organization, the international instrumentality for dealing with this problem. As an example of our earnest desire to participate in

solving an international problem, and to encourage other nations to do likewise, the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was passed. Apart from any of its specific provisions, its very enactment evidences the American people's recognition that partial solution of the problem of the displaced persons is by providing for resettlement in the United States.

Of course, the humanitarian issue is a matter of utmost importance whilst considering legislation of this kind. Within the American tradition is the attitude toward immigration expressed by the words on the Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to
breathe free.

If American immigration policy has moved away from the open door and open arms, the tradition of asylum for the oppressed and persecuted has continued. From the Cavalier, Huguenot, and Palestine refugees of colonial days to the German liberals of 1832 and 1849, the Jewish victims of Russian persecution in the 1880's, and the most recent refugees, the United States has received a succession of migrant peoples seeking refuge from political and religious oppression. In the most recent instance the United States, from the Evian Conference through the work of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, UNRRA, and the International Refugee Organization, has evidenced humanitarian concern for the victims of war and persecution in Europe, and has recently passed special legislation, as I said before, to facilitate the admission of a number of displaced persons. Modern discussion of the immigration policy in the United States has turned more in the direction of economic issues and other material considerations, but it is to be hoped that future decisions on immigration policy are not based entirely on immediate national advantage and self-interest. Especially at the present time, when the United Nations is faced with the heavy problem of the displaced persons who remain as political casualties of the war, it seems most desirable as an example of world leadership and responsibility that the United States continue to aid generously in the solution of world refugee problems.

Mr. Speaker, from all the reports that I have received, I am satisfied that the displaced persons who were permitted to come into our country have complied with our laws in every possible way and have not become charges upon the country, nor have they supplanted any American wage-earners. The orphans and minor children who have been admitted have found very excellent homes with good humane families that are delighted to have them as wards. As a matter of fact, there are thousands of requests on the part of our good-hearted American people who are desirous of adopting and providing for these unfortunate and suffering children, as well as others.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this legislation will relieve the Nation of millions of dollars annual expense to which it has hitherto been subjected across the oceans, and will not add additional burdens on our Government in any way.

I understand that 3 of the 25 members of the Committee on the Judiciary have filed a minority report. However, after reading the report I cannot help but regret that they have gone far afield in their fear of what this humane act will do. In view of our action in the last Congress, and in view of the plea of thousands of Americans who desire to provide for these unfortunates, I hope that there will be no opposition to this rule, nor opposition to this humane bill.

Just a few minutes ago, before I took the floor, I received a letter from my good friend, Frank Annunzio, director of the department of labor, State of Illinois, and attested by Virgil Lowder, chairman of the executive committee, the Illinois Displaced Persons Commission, which I insert herewith:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Chicago, May 26, 1949.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: In view of the imminent action of Congress on displaced-persons legislation, I want to convey to you the feeling which I know is shared by many of the members of the Illinois Displaced Persons Commission that some phases of the present Displaced Persons Act are unsatisfactory and unworkable. While the commission as a whole has not been asked to take any action on this matter, I have been urged by members of the commission to share with you our convictions regarding the present bill and to urge you to lend your full support to the revised Celler bill, H. R. 4567, now pending, which would correct some, though not all, of the limitations in the present bill.

You will be interested in knowing that Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson has endorsed and continued the work of the Illinois Displaced Persons Commission, which was originally appointed by former Gov. Dwight H. Green. Governor Stevenson has now provided the commission with an executive secretary in the person of Miss Marion S. Kirkland, with a staff secretary and with offices in the State of Illinois Building at 160 North LaSalle Street in Chicago.

We are continuing the survey of housing and job opportunities for displaced persons in Illinois, and are receiving cordial and strong support from the various religious faiths, labor, farm, and civic groups throughout the State. Our survey is now perhaps two-thirds complete.

Figures submitted by the Federal Displaced Persons Commission indicate that, as of March 31, 1949, Illinois ranks fourth among the States in the number of displaced persons received. New York is first, with 1,150; Pennsylvania second, with 919; New Jersey third, with 775; and Illinois has received 763. These persons have been heartily welcomed and are quickly adjusting to life in their new Nation, State, and community. We are certain that they will make splendid citizens. By thus receiving these who suffered so much for the ideals for which America stands, we have given a gesture of good will and hope to the entire world.

We know that you will do your utmost to advance this important program and shall be watching with great interest your stand on the Celler bill.

Cordially yours,

VIRGIL E. LOWDER,
Chairman, Executive Committee, the
Illinois Displaced Persons Com-
mission.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have hundreds of letters from people residing in all parts of the United States and from good women urging that this legislation be passed. The good women who I refer to are urging the admission of these unfortunate people perhaps to alleviate the difficult task of securing someone for their household tasks.

For the information of the Membership, the record shows that over 70 percent of the displaced persons thus far admitted to the United States are good Christians, and the balance, though not of the same church, believe just as strongly in the beautiful teachings and concepts, both moral and ethical, of their brethren. By this I mean that this minority group also believes in justice, brotherhood, charity, love, and freedom.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is my understanding correct to the effect that if this rule is adopted, the bill itself will not be taken up today?

Mr. SABATH. So I have been given to understand. We will only adopt the rule and the consideration of the bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there will be no request for time on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3734) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri how much the Senate has raised this bill over the House figures?

Mr. CANNON. On a rough computation, I would say about \$160,000,000.

Mr. TABER. That will just add to the burdens of the taxpayers if this is agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. I trust that the gentleman will join me in persuading the Senate to accept the House figures.

Mr. TABER. I shall do my best to try to keep it down.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. I wondered the other day when we had up the foreign-aid bill, and the gentleman was able to compromise, if he was trying to help the taxpayers or if he was trying to keep something in this particular case that might benefit some of the people of this country.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman knows that when you get a bill cut down \$600,000,000, you do not want to see it raised and that saving evaporated. I am sorry the gentleman does not appreciate that situation.

Mr. TACKETT. May I ask the gentleman why, then, he was so willing to compromise the other day to help foreign aid and at this time cannot do anything to help the people of this country?

Mr. TABER. Because I wanted to save that \$600,000,000.

Mr. TACKETT. Why did not the gentleman want to save something when it came to throwing away money on foreign soil?

Mr. TABER. When you are going to send more over if you do not compromise, you compromise sometimes.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; you compromise when you are helping big business, but you do not have any interest in the taxpayers of this country, do you?

Mr. TABER. That is not correct; I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, KERR, RABAUT, TABER, and WIGGLESWORTH.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DOYLE, for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. PASSMAN (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana), for the remainder of the week, beginning June 1, on account of official business in his district.

To Mr. CAVALCANTE, from June 2 through June 6, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

USE OF INJUNCTIONS IN LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to injunctions in any labor bill that this Congress may consider. There was a period of time in the early twenties in my district in Kentucky that many laboring men were afraid to openly admit that they belonged to a union. All unions in the coal fields in southeastern Kentucky were disbanded in 1922. The injunction played a great part in destroying those unions. I for one cannot accept the Republican philosophy, government by injunction, that was enacted into law in 1947. I think I state the convictions of many Members of the House and of the best informed and

most experienced men in the field of industrial relations, that the use of the injunction in labor disputes is one-sided and unfair and is bound to have the effect of weakening all the efforts of unions to obtain equality of bargaining power with employers.

Organized labor has had to fight against injunctions for years and with good reason. Injunctions have been issued which have deprived the representatives of workers of their fundamental rights of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press. They have deprived workers of the right to organize and to assist fellow workers.

When an injunction is sought in a labor dispute now it is for the purpose of prejudicing the union's position or breaking a strike. It prejudices the issue in favor of the corporation. It fortifies the employer's position. It makes the public think that the workers or the union have done something very wrong which it is necessary for the courts to restrain. The effect of the use of the most powerful resources of the law on the employer's side of industrial disputes is not lessened when only the Government can ask for an injunction, as provided in the Taft-Hartley Act. In fact, it makes the prejudice more complete. The Government is presumed to be acting in the public interest when, in fact, it may be aiding one side against another in an industrial dispute.

The injunction has always been a device of the antiunion employer and he used it freely to block unions right up to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act in 1932. Before the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed, sweeping injunctions were issued for all sorts of purposes, but all antilabor—to prevent workers from organizing—to enforce yellow-dog contracts, to prevent men from exercising their rights to assist each other, and to try to improve their economic position. The reasons and the precedents advanced by company lawyers were on the side of management, while the rights sought by labor were sometimes contrary to precedent. The use of the injunction thus kept labor down.

The injunctions were supposed to be emergency measures, made necessary because of the irreparable harm that might be done in industrial disputes. But the emergencies frequently lasted for 4 to 10 years, after which the orders would become permanent and the workers would be enjoined from further united action forevermore.

It may be argued that the cases cited below are out of date and not pertinent here, but they illustrate the point why organized labor is against injunctions.

Hitchman Coal and Coke v. Mitchell (245 U. S. 229—October 1917) involves the question of whether a union and/or its individual organizers can be enjoined from counseling by words and posters nonunion workers from obeying yellow-dog contracts. The court sustained the injunction, Brandeis, Holmes, and Clarke dissenting.

The Hitchman mine in the Panhandle of West Virginia was operated union from 1902 until the strike of 1906, when in June 1906 it reopened nonunion. The

mine management required its workers to sign yellow-dog agreements before giving them jobs. Hitchman was in competition with mines in Ohio which were closed-shop unionized, and its nonunion operations put it in a more favorable competitive position. In the fall of 1907 United Mine Workers sent an organizer down to the Panhandle on a recruiting drive against the Hitchman-owned mines and one other nonunion shaft. About 60 men from Hitchman joined UMW and, in defiance of their employment contracts, continued to work for the Hitchman management. At this point—1907—Hitchman went into the United States district court and got an injunction against further organizing, citing UMW, the organizer Hughes, and union officials Mitchell, Lewis, Green, Zelenka, and Watkins as parties defendant. No strike had been called against either of the two Hitchman mines involved nor had one been threatened. There was a strike call in the third mine, however. The Hitchman mine operated "non-union" under the equivalent of a temporary restraining order until the Supreme Court, in 1916, sustained the injunction's legality and ordered the district court to make it permanent.

The injunction as approved by the United States Supreme Court through Justice Pitney follows herein—245 United States Code, pages 229, 261—and restrains—

(1) Interfering or attempting to interfere with plaintiff's employees for the purpose of unionizing plaintiff's mine without its consent, by representing or causing to be represented to any of plaintiff's employees, or to any person who might become an employee of plaintiff, that such person will suffer or is likely to suffer some loss or trouble in continuing in or in entering the employment of plaintiff, by reason of plaintiff not recognizing the union, or because plaintiff runs a nonunion mine; (2) interfering or attempting to interfere with plaintiff's employees for the purpose of unionizing the mine without plaintiff's consent, and in aid of such purpose knowingly and willfully bringing about the breaking by plaintiff's employees of contracts of service known at the time to exist with plaintiff's present and future employees; (3) knowingly and willfully enticing plaintiff's employees, present or future, to leave plaintiff's service on the ground that plaintiff does not recognize the United Mine Workers of America or runs a nonunion mine, etc.; (4) interfering or attempting to interfere with plaintiff's employees so as knowingly and willfully to bring about the breaking by plaintiff's employees, present and future, of their contracts of service, known to the defendants to exist, and especially from knowingly and willfully enticing such employees, present or future, to leave plaintiff's service without plaintiff's consent; (5) trespassing on or entering upon the grounds and premises of plaintiff or its mine for the purpose of interfering therewith or hindering or obstructing its business, or with the purpose of compelling or inducing, by threats, intimidation, violent or abusive language, or persuasion, any of plaintiff's employees to refuse or fail to perform their duties as such; and (6) compelling or inducing or attempting to compel or induce, by threats, intimidation, or abusive or violent language, any of plaintiff's employees to leave its service or fail or refuse to perform their duties as such employees, or compelling or attempting to compel by like means any person desiring to seek employment in plaintiff's mine and works from so

accepting employment therein. (*International Organization, United Mine Workers of America et al. v. Red Jacket Consolidated Coal and Coke Co. et al.* (C. C. A. 4th, 1927) (18 F. (2d) 839, cert. denied, 275 U. S. 536).)

At this time the United Mine Workers had 475,000 members—75 percent of the coal miners in the United States—with the southern West Virginia field, herein involved, being the largest closed non-union field in the country. This suit for injunction grew out of a strike called on July 1, 1920, in an attempt to unionize that field. Suit was first filed September 30, 1920, followed by 315 others, all combined in this action. The injunction was sustained. Injunctions were issued against Green, Lewis, and Murray, although nonresidents of the district at the outset. In this case the court stated that it was not a Sherman Act conspiracy to carry out the aim of the union to organize all nonunion fields by peaceful persuasion, but went on to say that it was an unlawful conspiracy to interfere with the contractual relations the petitioners had with their individual miners—yellow-dog contracts—and that, therefore, the UMW could be enjoined from organizing so long as such contracts remained valid and in force. No explanation was offered as to how the union could engage in organizing activities without interfering with yellow-dog contractual relations. This case relies to a large degree on *Hitchman Coal and Coke v. Mitchell* (245 U. S. 229).

The injunction is substantially as follows—Eighteenth Federal Reports, second, pages 839, 842—and restrains the union and its organizers—

1. From interfering with the employees of the plaintiffs or with men seeking employment at their mines by menaces, threats, violence, or injury to them, their persons, families, or property, or abusing them, or their families, or by doing them violence in any way or manner whatsoever, or by doing any other act or thing that will interfere with the right of such employees and those seeking employment to work upon such terms as to them seem proper, unmolested, and from in any manner injuring or destroying the properties of the plaintiffs, or either of them, or from counseling or advising that these plaintiffs should in any way or manner be injured in the conduct and management of their business and in the enjoyment of their property and property rights.

2. From trespassing upon the properties of the plaintiffs, or either of them, or by themselves, or in cooperation with others, from inciting, inducing, or persuading the employees of the plaintiffs to break their contract of employment with the plaintiffs.

3. From aiding or assisting any other person or persons to commit or attempt to commit any of the acts herein enjoined.

A typical suit among the 315 which resulted in the above decision was *United Mine Workers v. Carbon Fuel Co.* (288 Fed. 1020; 1923) where the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals refused to go into the merits of a temporary injunction issued by the District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia. This was in May 1923. The case went back to the district court for trial on the merits and finally received full review in 18 F. (2d) 839. Thus for over 4 years the union operated under a temporary injunction that restrained it from interfering with the employees of the plain-

tiffs or with men seeking employment at their mines by menaces or violence or "by doing any other act or thing whatsoever or from counseling or advising that these plaintiffs should in any way or manner be injured in the conduct of their business or in the enjoyment of their properties and property rights"—*Gasaway v. Borderland Coal Corp.* (275 Fed. 871, modified C. C. A. 7, 1921; 278 Fed. 56).

It may be interesting to note the scope of some of the injunctions being handed down in the southern West Virginia unionization fight during the early twenties. The one set forth below was modified by the circuit court but was in effect during 3 crucial months of a large-scale regional strike.

The injunction follows:

That certain corporations organized under the State of Indiana and citizens and residents of said State, individually and as representatives of the class of persons made defendants in the original and amended bill of complaint filed herein, be, and they are hereby, and each of them is hereby, enjoined and restrained from collecting over and through their pay rolls, or over and through the pay rolls of either of them, or in any other manner, any and all moneys as dues and assessments levied or charged by the said United Mine Workers of America, its officials or members, upon or against its members, employees of said individuals and of said defendant corporations, or who may hereafter be employed by them, or either of them, under the check-off provisions of the contracts in evidence herein, and heretofore executed by, or on behalf of, said named defendants and the officials or members of said United Mine Workers of America, or under any and all contract or contracts that may hereafter be executed between the said defendants and the officials or members of the said United Mine Workers of America, and from paying the same to the officials, members or representatives of said United Mine Workers of America.

That the defendants and . . . all persons who now are, or hereafter may be, members of said United Mine Workers of America, and all persons combining, confederating, or conspiring with the said designated persons, and all other persons whomsoever, and each and every one of them, be and they are hereby enjoined and restrained:

From advising, assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, or in any way or manner, and by any and all means whatsoever by the use of any funds or moneys howsoever collected by the International Union, United Mine Workers of America, its officers, members, agents, or representatives, to the unionization or the attempted unionization of the nonunion mines in Mingo County, W. Va., and Pike County, Ky. (278 Fed. 56, 61).

It may be noted that the check-off in union mines in Indiana was apparently enjoined because of its effect in supporting strikers in southern West Virginia, and that the mere existence of yellow-dog agreements was evidently assumed to be a reason to bar a union from attempted unionization by any means whatsoever. The union was enjoined from all activity except payment to striking miners of funds for actual necessities. And the resources which the union needed to do even this much were completely cut off.

The circuit court modified the injunction by excising the ban on Indiana check-off contracts and by directing the district court to enjoin only that union

activity shown by the bill of complaint—the injunction was much broader than the relief requested in the complaint.

On April 22, 1922, the District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, McClintic, judge, presiding, issued an injunction—herein printed in part—against the United Mine Workers and some 50 union leaders on behalf of the Southern West Virginia operators. This was part of the fight against unionization in Mingo County, W. Va.

And each of them is restrained and enjoined from doing, or causing to be done, any act or thing that will suppress or unduly limit the rights of the plaintiffs to employ nonunion labor, or that will restrict or prevent the rights of the plaintiffs from voluntarily contracting with their employees . . . that the said organization, the defendants herein named, and all of the other officials, members, agents, and representatives, be, and they are hereby restrained and enjoined from doing any further act or thing that will create or further tend to create and establish a monopoly of mine labor for the purpose of unreasonably increasing wages, or the price of labor above what it should be under normal conditions; and from in any way interfering with, or restricting free competition among those seeking employment in the mines of these plaintiffs . . . restrained and enjoined from taking further steps, or from doing any further act, or thing, to unionize the mines of these plaintiffs by persuasion, by the use of money, or other thing of value . . . or in any way interfering with the contracts of employment with their employees . . . and to discharge them as they see fit, with or without cause; . . . restrained and enjoined from holding mass meetings in said New River district, or from massing at any of the points within the said district, the officials, members, agents, representatives and sympathizers of said union. (*Taliaferro v. U. S.* (290 Fed. 214, affirmed C. C. A. 4th, 1923; 290 Fed. 906).)

Taliaferro, a barber, displayed an 8-by-6-inch sign in his window. The sign said, "No scabs wanted in here." At the time there was a strike being carried on in defiance of a Federal Railway Labor Board ruling and an injunction supporting the ruling. The injunction was broad enough to forbid displays by strikers and sympathizers against nonunion and nonstriking workers. Held: Taliaferro was guilty of criminal contempt for violating a valid injunction, fined \$200, and determined not entitled to a jury trial under section 20 of the Clayton Act.

This case, though not involving the United Mine Workers, may perhaps be cited as an example of the difficulties encountered in some localities by persons sympathetic with the union movement, and the use of the injunction in such connection. Here a man, not a striker or a union member, was convicted of violating an injunction because he expressed an opinion in a peaceable manner. The appellate court used as justification the assumption that a non-striker would be made to feel uncomfortable if referred to as a "scab." But as a practical matter, the preliminary injunction settled the case. The employer was able to restrain the workers or their unions. The situation does not remain in status quo when one side is restrained in an industrial dispute. The employer resumes his efforts to defeat

the workers, but they are restrained from dealing with his tactics. The result is that organization is prevented or the union is defeated.

These injunctions were granted solely on the complaint of interested or professional witnesses without the safeguards afforded even by criminal law—without indictment, without being confronted with witnesses, without cross-examination, without trial by jury, and imposed without uniform statute at the discretion of the particular judge selected. In time the mounting protests of the unfair exercise of judicial power led to its restraint by the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

The fight against the use of the injunction in labor disputes took many years before the effective Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in 1932. Labor has by tradition always opposed the injunction. The American Federation of Labor in convention assembled in 1919 declared their policy to be as follows regarding the injunction:

The fate of the sovereignty of American people again hangs in the balance. It is inconceivable that such an autocratic, despotic, and tyrannical power can long remain in a democracy. One or the other must ultimately give way.

The chief point of the Norris-LaGuardia Act was that it took the judicial restraints off the efforts of workers to form unions for mutual aid and protection. Federal courts were prohibited from exercising the injunctive power in labor cases when the use of such power is contrary to the stated public policy of the act—that of permitting workers to form organizations for mutual aid and to engage in concerted activities in dealing with corporations and aggregations of capital.

To labor particularly, the preceding abuse of judicial power is a sad memory. In matters vital to them this great power had been used to strengthen and protect the other side. It can thus be understood why labor objects to the return of government by injunction.

We are supposed to have started on a new course after the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, to encourage the practice of collective bargaining. We said that there was a public interest in free collective bargaining and we went further in promoting this policy under the Wagner Act. We must remember that collective bargaining is not a labor policy nor a management policy, but a public policy. It carries with it some risks and inconveniences, but collective bargaining, with either side free to reject the terms of the other, is the only practical way for an industrial society to avoid dictation by one side or the other, and to avoid the fixing of wages and prices and ultimately everything else by governmental authority.

The plain fact is that the injunctions issued under the Taft-Hartley Act have not settled industrial disputes. They change the issues but they do not promote a meeting of minds nor promote conditions which lead to compromise on both sides.

During the period the Taft-Hartley Act has been in operation, the injunction has been invoked seven times, but stoppages occurred in five of these cases. In one of the other two cases, a big fine was imposed, but the issues of the strike were not settled by the injunction. Even in the seventh case—the atomic energy dispute—the injunction was dismissed after 80 days. The settlement was made by the intervention of officers of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor with the assistance of the Mediation and Conciliation Service, even though the company operating the plant had refused the union's offer to arbitrate.

The national emergency provision in H. R. 2032 shortens the waiting period to 25 days, but it requires that the status quo be maintained during this period and that the board of inquiry make actual recommendations.

Experts in the field of conciliation and mediation stated before our committee that this procedure was an improvement over the provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act and makes completely unnecessary the resort to the injunction process.

The way for the Government to promote settlement of industrial disputes is to furnish machinery for settlements—mediation and fact-finding machinery—and to assist the parties to come to agreements rather than by clubbing one party to the dispute, putting it on the defensive, making it appear that it was engaged in some criminal activity and then bypassing the dispute by requiring that party to defend itself against the injunction. The other party has practically won the dispute by that time and it can stand pat on its original offer.

We must take the risks of effective collective bargaining if we are to maintain our freedom and equal justice under the law.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1527. An act to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1357. An act to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument, in the State of Maine.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 31, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1057. An act for the relief of John Keith; and

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Peccs River compact.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 2, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

658. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 28, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on, and preliminary examinations and surveys of, Anacostia River and its tributaries, District of Columbia and Maryland, and Potomac River and tributaries, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 17, 1937, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and the act of May 5, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

659. A letter from the Director, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, transmitting from Governor Stainback a copy of Joint Resolution 23, recently enacted by the Legislature of Hawaii, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation enabling the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue bonds for the construction of certain public park improvements in the city of Honolulu; to the Committee on Public Lands.

660. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter in reference to the case of Hilary Ferdinand Sawicki, file No. A-6677176 CR 23110, and requesting that it be withdrawn from the cases now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

661. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill for the creation of a trust fund for the retirement of policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia and to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3895. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILES: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3788. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; with an amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOSONE; Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4070. A bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY; Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3680. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 5.1 acres of land in Washington County, Miss., to the Mississippi State College; without amendment (Rept. No. 717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4932. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Kilmarnock, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4933. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Chincoteague Island, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4934. A bill to provide for a new Federal building for the Fort Monroe Quarantine Station, Fort Monroe, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4935. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4936. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Tappahannock, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4937. A bill to remove the limitation on the commencement of prosecutions for offenses arising from espionage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4938. A bill to limit the removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSALIS:

H. R. 4939. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of family partnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4940. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 with respect to reenlistment of enlisted men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4941. A bill to remove the discrimination against Indians in the enforcement of Federal and State laws concerned with the use and sale of intoxicating beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4942. A bill to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys realized from leases made by the Seneca Nation of Indians, of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 4943. A bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union by increasing the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State by such act for educational purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4944. A bill to amend Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress, section 624; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4945. A bill to provide gold-star lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin

of persons who lost their lives as the result of serving in the armed forces of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 4946. A bill to repeal the excise tax on transportation of property, transportation of persons, and long-distance telephone and telegraph; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 4947. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with certain organizations to carry out the functions of the poundmaster of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4948. A bill relating to the policing of the building and grounds of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 4949. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to accept the Croix de Guerre from the Government of France on behalf of the Seventh Armored Division; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4950. A bill to assist blind veterans by amending an act entitled "An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 4951. A bill to exempt from the minimum-wage and maximum-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act the employees of certain industries which are in competition with foreign industries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide for economy in government by reducing expenditures for the fiscal year 1950 consistent with the public interest; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution to reduce the compensation of Members of the House of Representatives by 5 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 233. Resolution authorizing expenses of conducting investigation of certain matters pertaining to the merchant marine and fisheries of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 234. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters involving the B-36 bomber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 235. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2960, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 236. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4009, a bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, requesting the carrying into effect of the administrative recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose the federalization of the National Guard of the United States and the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in whole or in part; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 4205, a bill providing automobiles for certain blind veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to H. R. 2990, a bill relative to the granting of assistance to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relative to the Federal excise tax on motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose the federalization of the National Guard of the United States and the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in whole or in part; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 4952. A bill for the relief of Allan Chan; his wife, Mrs. Eileen Chan; and their minor daughter, Karol Beverly Chan Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4953. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfred Josef Fialla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 4954. A bill for the relief of Jacob F. Hutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4955. A bill for the relief of Chin Ta Bin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 4956. A bill for the relief of Tsungmer Dow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 4957. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gordon E. Hubley, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4958. A bill for the relief of William Morris Gilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4959. A bill to reimburse the Fisher Contracting Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 4961. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Vice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 4962. A bill for the relief of Daphne E. Hardoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

986. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Massachusetts Society, Sons of the American Revolution, for investigation of subversive textbooks and teaching material; to the Committee on Rules.

987. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of 93 Massachusetts citizens, in opposition to the recent reduction of the Veterans' Administration hospital program by 16,000 beds; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

988. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Kenosha, Wis., protesting against H. R. 4349, a bill providing that unclaimed animals of the District of Columbia be made available to licensed institutions for scientific purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, whose dwelling place is light without the shadow of our earth-born clouds, we, who at our best but see as through a glass darkly, come seeking the radiance of Thy presence. In these fateful days for whose decisions the future will judge us, may we maintain our integrity unsullied by animosities, prejudices, or personal ambitions, regarding always public office as a sacred trust. As with our fallible judgments we have a part in the shaping of the world that is to be, give to us the vision, the wisdom, the courage that will make for both justice and lasting peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 1, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4617) to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1357) to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument, in the

State of Maine, heretofore signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Murray
Baldwin	Humphrey	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bridges	Ives	O'Connor
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Donnell	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Downey	Kem	Schoeppel
Eastland	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Lodge	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	Lucas	Taft
Flanders	McCarran	Taylor
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McFarland	Tydings
Graham	McGrath	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	Magnuson	Williams
Hayden	Martin	Withers
Hill	Maybank	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on official business at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent on official business, presiding at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Kansas

[Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are excused by the Senate for attendance at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are detained at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture.

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made:

The members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are in attendance at a meeting of the said committee in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

PRICE SUPPORT AND FARM-MARKETING QUOTAS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to stabilize farm income and farm prices of agricultural commodities; to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend the rights and privileges of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

"Whereas the right of most veterans of World War II to receive readjustment allowances under title V of the Federal Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (known as the GI bill of rights) expires July 25, 1949; and

"Whereas only about one-half of unemployed Alabama veterans of World War II have rights to benefits under the Alabama unemployment compensation; and

"Whereas unemployment among Alabama veterans is increasing; and

"Whereas economic conditions in the near future may be such as to cause great hardship and financial distress to such veterans and their families: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alabama do herewith memorialize and petition the Eighty-first Congress of the United States of America now in session in the city of Washington, D. C., to extend the rights and privileges of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Alabama and the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House."